

THE MAGIC IN HISTORY SERIES

FORBIDDEN RITES

A Necromancer's Manual of the Fifteenth Century

*Richard Kieckhefer*

CONJURING SPIRITS

Texts and Traditions of Medieval Ritual Magic

*Edited by Claire Fanger*

RITUAL MAGIC

*Elizabeth M. Butler*

THE FORTUNES OF FAUST

*Elizabeth M. Butler*

THE BATHHOUSE AT MIDNIGHT

An Historical Survey of Magic and Divination in Russia

*W. F. Ryan*

SPIRITUAL AND DEMONIC MAGIC

From Ficino to Campanella

*D. P. Walker*

ICONS OF POWER

Ritual Practices in Late Antiquity

*Naomi Janowitz*

BATTLING DEMONS

Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages

*Michael D. Bailey*

PRAYER, MAGIC, AND THE STARS

IN THE LATE ANCIENT AND ANTIQUE WORLD

*Edited by Scott Noegel, Joel Walker, and Brannon Wheeler*

BINDING WORDS

Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages

*Don C. Skemer*

STRANGE REVELATIONS

Magic, Poison, and Sacrilege in Louis XIV's France

*Lynn Wood Mollenauer*

UNLOCKED BOOKS

Manuscripts of Learned Magic in the Medieval Libraries of Central Europe

*Benedek Láng*

ALCHEMICAL BELIEF

Occultism in the Religious Culture of Early Modern England

*Bruce Janacek*

The Magic in History series explores the role magic and the occult have played in European culture, religion, science, and politics. Titles in the series will bring the resources of cultural, literary, and social history to bear on the history of the magic arts, and will contribute towards an understanding of why the theory and practice of magic have elicited fascination at every level of European society. Volumes will include both editions of important texts and significant new research in the field.

MAGIC in HISTORY

INVOKING ANGELS

THEURGIC IDEAS and PRACTICES,  
THIRTEENTH to SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

*Edited by*  
**CLAIRE FANGER**

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA

## CONTENTS

Elliot R. Wolfson's "Language, Secrecy, and the Mysteries of Law: Theurgy and the Christian Kabbalah of Johannes Reuchlin" is reprinted with permission from *Kabbalah: A Journal for the Study of Jewish Mystical Texts* 13 (2005): 7–41.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Invoking angels : theurgic ideas and practices, thirteenth to sixteenth centuries / edited by Claire Fanger.

p. cm. — (The magic in history series)

Summary: "A collection of essays examining medieval and early modern texts aimed at performing magic or receiving illumination via the mediation of angels. Includes discussion of Jewish, Christian and Muslim texts"—Provided by publisher.

Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and index.

ISBN 978-0-271-05142-0 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Theurgy—History.

I. Fanger, Claire.

BF1623.T56I58 2012

133.4'3—dc23

2011031498

Copyright © 2012 The Pennsylvania State University

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

Published by The Pennsylvania State University Press,  
University Park, PA 16802-1003

The Pennsylvania State University Press is a member of the Association of American University Presses.

It is the policy of The Pennsylvania State University Press to use acid-free paper. Publications on uncoated stock satisfy the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Material, ANSI Z39.48–1992.

This book is printed on Natures Natural, which contains 50% post-consumer waste.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

### INTRODUCTION: THEURGY, MAGIC, AND MYSTICISM

*Claire Fanger*

### I. Texts of the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries

1	Magic, Theurgy, and Spirituality in the Medieval Ritual of the <i>Ars notoria</i>	37
	<i>Julien Véronèse (English translation by Claire Fanger)</i>	
2	Uplifting Souls: The <i>Liber de essentia spirituum</i> and the <i>Liber Razielis</i>	79
	<i>Sophie Page</i>	
3	The <i>Liber iuratus Honorii</i> and the Christian Reception of Angel Magic	113
	<i>Katelyn Mesler</i>	
4	Honorius and the Sigil of God: The <i>Liber iuratus</i> in Berengario Ganell's <i>Summa sacre magice</i>	151
	<i>Jan R. Veenstra</i>	
5	Covenant and the Divine Name: Revisiting the <i>Liber iuratus</i> and John of Morigny's <i>Liber florum</i>	192
	<i>Claire Fanger</i>	

vii

1

37

79

113

151

192

82. "Et diligent eos angeli celorum. Et spiritu boni associabunt ipsos. Et habebunt gratiam creatoris . . . et qui istas virtutes supradictas in se habuerit scias quod erit spiritualis et non terrestris. . . . Et dicitur iste liber, *Liber mundicie* quia res munde ascendent superius. Et res ponderose et immunde descendunt inferius, unde dicitur quod per istum librum qui de eo operatur sit spiritualis et recedit et separatur a terrestribus et dicitur ab aliquibus spiritualis." *Liber mundicie*, chapter 1, Vat. Reg. lat 1300, fol. 87v.

83. "Et dixit Salomon mundicia est res que facit hominem sanctum et congregat spiritus et facit eos socios hominis et facit scire secreta angelorum et iste tractatus est liber que multum frequentabant prophete et alii antiqui cum ipsis et si ista feceris que continetur in isto libro de mundicia proficies semper cum adiutorio Domini que est proprius Dominus." *Liber mundicie*, chapter 9, Halle, ULB, 14. B. 36, fol. 65v.

84. "Sunt igitur omni quod movetur spiritus addicti, qui semitas ex creatoris iugo permitem percurunt." CC 125, fol. 170.

85. "Hic igitur, et nonnulli postmodum, posuit quosdam de spiritibus huiusmodi cecidisse, vel cadere in diversas partes terrarum, et marium, et in illis partibus potestatem unumquemque habere, in quas cecidisse, vel cadere in diversas partes terrarum, et marium, et in illis partibus potestatem unumquemque habere, in quas ceciderit. Unde alios in desertis, alios in silvis, alios in fontibus, alios in fluminibus potestatem habere posuit, et in herbis, et arboribus, et arbustis, necnon in gemmis et lapidibus preciosis eos dixit virtutes vreas exercere, et in ipsis etiam habitare." William of Auvergne, *De universo* II.3.6, p. 1025a. This passage probably refers to the section on the spirits of the four elements, which is missing in the incomplete copy of the text in CC 125.

86. On the former genre, see, for example, Claire Fanger's introduction to *Conjuring Spirits*; on the latter, Nicolas Weill-Parot, "Dans le ciel ou sous le ciel? Les anges dans la magie astrale, XIIe–XIVe siècle," in Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, "Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge," 757–71.

87. "Et si viderit me non recordetur de me aliquod contrarium nec aliquam vindictam et inveniam gratiam in suis oculis." BnF, 3666, fol. 26, addressing the angels of the third degree of the second sphere.

88. BnF, 3666, Vat. Reg. lat. 1300, and Halle, ULB, 14. B. 36. Two volumes recorded in the library of Charles V and Charles VI of France are also likely candidates. A "Liber pluritatis Razielis" was recorded in a 1373 inventory of the library and a "Liber sapientum super arte magica, autrement dit Raziel" in a 1411 inventory. See Léopold Delisle, *Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V*, vol. 2 (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1907), 155, nos. 699 and 700. Other occult items were present in the library, including a "Liber seminafora" (no. 715).

89. München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 51, fol. 111.

90. See Frank Klaassen, "Medieval Ritual Magic in the Renaissance," *Aries* 3, no. 2 (2003): 166–99, especially the comments on manuscripts Sloane 3846 (p. 187) and Lübeck, Bibliothek der Hansestadt, Math. 4° 9 (184n46), sixteenth-century ritual magic collections that include the *Liber Razielis* as well as standard image magic texts.

91. In superscript above this name: "id est scriptor salomonis."

92. Inconsistent numeral styles in the manuscript are retained here and below.

# 3

## THE *Liber iuratus Honorii* AND THE CHRISTIAN RECEPTION OF ANGEL MAGIC

Katelyn Mesler

Few Christians in the Middle Ages would have denied that sorcerers were capable of summoning demons. It was a generally accepted aspect of Christian cosmology and a practice long considered forbidden.<sup>1</sup> But what about angels? While they could be the objects of prayers and were occasionally accorded an intercessory role similar to that of the saints, the notion of magically summoning an angel and constraining it to obedience was rather unorthodox and, for most Christians, quite unthinkable. Yet a work of learned magic known as the *Sworn Book of Honorius*, which circulated in two versions from at least the fourteenth century, teaches techniques not only for invoking angels but also for conjuring and commanding them.<sup>2</sup> One of the prescribed rituals begins with weeks of fasting and abstinence, careful preservation of moral and ritual purity, steadfast attendance at masses, and nearly incessant prayer. A set of ritual objects, including a piece of parchment bearing the name of God, is then taken to a secluded circle of stones. After the proper prayers, suffumigations, and genuflections, the angels are addressed:

I thus invoke you, powerful angels, and by invoking, I conjure you. I mightily command the ruling powers of the heavenly majesty, by him . . . and by his ineffable name . . . at the sound of which all the celestial, terrestrial, and infernal hosts tremble and worship [cf. Philem. 2:10], and by these names, which are Rethala, Rabam, Cauthalee, Durhulo, Archyma,

I would like to thank Jan Bulman, Courtney Kneupper, Robert E. Lerner, Jesse Njus, Dylan C. Pennings, Victoria Prussing, Sarah L. Schwarz, Michael D. Swartz, and Lora Walsh for their generous assistance at various stages in the production of this chapter. I am especially grateful to Richard Kieckhefer, Claire Fanger, and Jan R. Veenstra for their invaluable suggestions.

Rabur, that by the spheres of Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, and the Moon, at every occasion, without malice, in a benevolent form, and placated by my small gift, you shall deign to descend . . . within the circles inscribed here, ready to obey me in all lawful and worthy requests.<sup>3</sup>

As suggested by the invocation, the ritual is supposed to end with the appearance of an angel, who will obediently carry out the wishes of the conjurer.

One can only speculate about whether anyone in the Middle Ages actually attempted to follow this complicated and laborious procedure through to its end, for most of the few existing accounts of this text were written by detractors who condemned the work as demonic. Nor do we know anything about the undoubtedly pseudonymous author “Honorius”<sup>4</sup> other than a few general details discernible from internal textual evidence. Emerging research, however, suggests that this text and its author were more popular (or notorious) than the scanty references would lead us to believe. And even had it not been so well known, the text would remain significant on account of the remarkable evidence it provides for two notable developments in the cultural history of late medieval European Christendom.

First, the text represents an important stage in the history of medieval magic. If the rituals described are not entirely original or unique to the *Sworn Book*, the text nonetheless exemplifies certain practices and ideas that were developing within the Christian magical tradition. Indeed, Honorius’s treatise challenges contemporary assumptions about magic and thus plays a significant role in the larger context of legal and theological debates over the status of magical practices. Second, the *Sworn Book* provides a striking example of a type of cultural transmission and adaptation that was becoming more common in the period. The reception and influence of Islamic ideas in the Latin West has long occupied historians such as Lynn Thorndike, Charles Homer Haskins, David Pingree, and Charles Burnett.<sup>5</sup> Magical texts such as the *Sworn Book*, however, pose particular problems for evaluating the reception of ideas from Arabic and Hebrew sources, for we know very little about the author, the context of composition, or any direct textual sources. But I would like to propose that at least one element of this text—the role and representation of angels—can offer us insight into the author’s appropriation of Jewish and Islamic magical practices for a purportedly Christian purpose. This approach offers suggestive perspectives on the ways in which the *Sworn Book* attests to an awareness of cultural transmission, demonstrates both direct and indirect influences from these external sources, and provides unique evidence for understanding attitudes toward such borrowing.

### 1. The *Sworn Book*: Textual Traditions and Dating

The most important advance in research on the *Sworn Book* is Jan Veenstra’s identification (in chapter 4 of this volume) of two separate textual traditions. The first, hitherto unknown to scholars, was transmitted in Spain by Berengario Ganell in his magical compendium the *Summa sacre magice*. Although this version was certainly affected by the personality of the redactor, it nevertheless appears to preserve certain features of Honorius’s original text.<sup>6</sup> The second and later textual tradition of the *Sworn Book*, which has been the basis for all previous work on the text, is known from a few manuscripts compiled in England and now preserved in the British Library in London.<sup>7</sup> Since this version is available in Gösta Hedegård’s Latin edition, it is this latter tradition that has been the basis of my treatment here, although much of my analysis may apply equally to both versions.

The London redaction of the *Sworn Book* is divided into a prologue and five sections. The prologue recounts a dramatic narrative concerning the work’s composition. As the story goes, the pope and other high-ranking church officials have been manipulated by demons into believing that the magical arts are evil. In the face of impending persecution, and out of fear that their art would be lost, a council of magicians gathered to preserve the secrets of magic. They chose Honorius to commit this magical knowledge to writing, and he did so with the help of an angel named Hocrohel. The magicians then swore an oath to protect the secrets contained in the book, and therefore it is known as the “sworn” book.<sup>8</sup> This prologue evokes the historiolae common in pseudepigraphal and magical texts, in which the account of the text’s origin, often describing how it was handed down from biblical figures, attests to its authenticity and authority. But however historically implausible this account may be, it provides invaluable evidence for determining the date of composition and offers explicit commentary on contemporary attitudes toward magic.

Historians have contested the dating of the *Sworn Book*. Jan Veenstra suggests that a date in the early fourteenth century remains plausible, but he cautions that there is nothing to rule out a point of origin in the thirteenth century. Evidence that depends on textual details particular to the London version suggests a date for the redaction of that version most probably during the pontificates of John XXII (1316–34) or his successor, Benedict XII (1334–42). These textual details include an emphasis on attaining the beatific vision, incorporation of material from the *Ars notoria*, polemics directed against Jews rather than Muslims, and a prologue reframing the myth of the text’s origin in a time period when magic was under a newly heightened attack from the church.<sup>9</sup> Since all of these

elements play a role in my analysis, it is worth reassessing the evidence for dating, both to establish the likely parameters for the text's composition and to confirm the dating of the London tradition with greater certainty.

Initial arguments for an early thirteenth-century date were based largely on a *Liber sacratus* mentioned by William of Auvergne, who was bishop of Paris from 1228 to 1249.<sup>10</sup> There is, however, no clear indication that he was referring to any version of the *Sworn Book* under discussion in this volume; as Richard Kieckhefer has already noted, there are many books that might have been characterized as "consecrated" or "sworn."<sup>11</sup> Concerning the London tradition, new evidence from the doctoral dissertation of Julien Véronèse on the *Ars notoria* conclusively rules out such an early date, for he has shown that the prayers in the London *Sworn Book* depend on the later glossed version of the *Ars notoria*—a third recension of this text, which postdates both an earlier glossed version and the original unglossed version.<sup>12</sup> While this evidence is absent from the tradition represented in Ganell, so that there is nothing conclusively to rule out a thirteenth-century date of origin, it remains questionable whether a work originating in Spain even in the early part of thirteenth century could have been in circulation in northern France as early as the 1240s.

The writings of John of Morigny provide further evidence that the *Sworn Book* tradition probably does not date much earlier than 1300.<sup>13</sup> In particular, there is no indication that John, who wrote between 1301 and 1315, knew the *Sworn Book*, even though he knew the *Ars notoria* in the glossed version (and probably in the unglossed version as well), and he mentions several other magic texts.<sup>14</sup> Thus the circumstantial evidence from the *Liber florum* generally supports the possibility that the *Sworn Book* was not in wide circulation in northern France before 1316. The earliest known manuscript of this version dates to the first half of the fourteenth century.<sup>15</sup>

Nevertheless, a later date for the London version seems unlikely, for there is good reason to trace the redaction of the *Sworn Book* to the papal reign of John XXII or Benedict XII. Either one could have been envisaged as the target of the prologue's polemics, as both men devoted considerable energy to arraigning suspected sorcerers.<sup>16</sup> But the fact that only one pope is mentioned in the story may indicate that it was in fact during John's pontificate that the *Sworn Book* was redacted. This assumption is supported by an additional piece of circumstantial evidence related to the text's emphasis on the beatific vision.<sup>17</sup> John XXII caused an uproar during the last few years of his pontificate (1331–34) when he began preaching that the vision of God could not be obtained until after the Final Judgment. He recanted on his deathbed and the matter was officially settled two years later in Benedict's encyclical *Benedictus Deus* (1336), which supported the common opinion that the elect would experience the vision immediately after

death.<sup>18</sup> The issue was, perhaps, never so high-profile, and thus the centrality of the beatific vision in the London version of the *Sworn Book* may reflect the redactor's awareness of the controversy.

But while John and his opponents differed on how soon after death the vision would be seen,<sup>19</sup> the first section of the *Sworn Book*, which constitutes more than half of the complete text, is specifically devoted to a position that is more reminiscent of the one condemned at the Council of Vienne (1311–12): attainment of the vision during life, by one's own efforts—in this case, by means of a magical ritual.<sup>20</sup> This portion of the text consists of several parts: instructions for creating the "sigil of God," which is a magical seal used in the rituals;<sup>21</sup> a listing of several prayers, which are recited in various sequences throughout the remainder of the text; a ritual for obtaining a dream vision to learn if one has God's permission to proceed with the operation; and the performance of the ritual, lasting an extra seventy-two days, that leads to the beatific vision.<sup>22</sup>

## 2. "Honorius": Background and Influences

Even if John XXII or the Council of Vienne provided some inspiration for the emphasis on the beatific vision, it was another source that shaped the content. It is this first section of the text, dealing with the beatific vision, in which Kieckhefer recognized strong traces of Jewish thought.<sup>23</sup> Lacking evidence for any direct textual source, he nonetheless identified several elements in the treatise that, whether directly or indirectly, ultimately attest to the influence of Jewish mysticism and magic—in particular, similarities with the Hekhalot literature of Merkavah mysticism and the mystical techniques of Abraham Abulafia. These include the work's goal of viewing God during life, the emphasis on moral and ritual purity as a prerequisite for magical practices, the magical use of a seal on which the name of God is written, the ritual attainment of dream visions, and a suggestion in the prologue that the book should be buried rather than destroyed.<sup>24</sup> To the evidence noted by Kieckhefer we might add Honorius's explanation of Exodus 33:20, which is reminiscent of a kabbalistic interpretation mentioned by Nachmanides,<sup>25</sup> as well as the repeated assertion of seeing the "celestial palace," which, although certainly not unknown in Christian thought, is a central motif of Hekhalot literature.<sup>26</sup> In addition, Jean-Patrice Boudet has emphasized the potential of Jewish influence in the use of the seventy-two-letter name of God, as found in magical texts of Jewish influence such as the *Liber Razielis*,<sup>27</sup> and in the linguistic features of certain angelic names.<sup>28</sup>

The second, third, and fourth sections of the *Sworn Book* take on a very different tone from the first part of the work. These three sections focus on the

conjuring of planetary angels, airy angels, and terrestrial angels, respectively. Sections two and three are parallel in structure, providing information about the spirits and then describing the ritual used to summon them, which is based in part on the ritual for the beatific vision. The fourth section, though following the same general structure, is radically abridged and lacks the detail of the second and third parts. There is also a fifth section, which is somewhat conspicuous in both content and prose style. It repeats earlier details, providing clarification on a few points of ritual from the first and third sections, and then offers a brief conclusion to the work. The evidence suggests that this section was not part of the original version of the *Sworn Book*.<sup>29</sup> In comparison to the ritual for the beatific vision, these final portions of the *Sworn Book* have received little scholarly attention. I will demonstrate, however, that these sections are not only innovative in their appropriation of Jewish and Islamic elements but also have wide implications with respect to the historical context of the fourteenth century.

Much less is known about the original author, and even the little that can be discerned is complicated by the difficulty of distinguishing him from later redactors. Only further textual analysis may resolve this difficulty. At present, I will continue to speak generally of Honorius, with the understanding that his “personality,” as preserved in the London tradition, is a combination of the original author and an unknown number of redactors. The question of Honorius’s language skills is of particular interest when considering the influence of works in languages other than Latin. On the one hand, he discusses etymologies from Hebrew, Arabic, and Greek, which may derive from some personal acquaintance with these languages.<sup>30</sup> On the other hand, a misspelling of the tetragrammaton as “ioth, he, vau, deleth” appears to confirm that he is no skilled Hebraist.<sup>31</sup> Veenstra has shown that this particular error can probably be imputed to a redactor and thus may not be characteristic of all stages in the production of the *Sworn Book*, but scrutiny of the text ultimately reveals no conclusive evidence for knowledge of these languages.

Additional evidence from the text sheds light on Honorius’s level of education. Throughout the text, he incorporates—and occasionally alters (whether intentionally or inadvertently)—passages from scripture,<sup>32</sup> the baptismal rite,<sup>33</sup> the preface for Easter,<sup>34</sup> the *Ave Maria*,<sup>35</sup> the *Salve Regina*,<sup>36</sup> the Apostle’s Creed,<sup>37</sup> the *Pater Noster*,<sup>38</sup> the *Sanctus*,<sup>39</sup> and the Creed of Athanasius.<sup>40</sup> He also paraphrases quotations from one of Jerome’s letters<sup>41</sup> and from Pseudo-Augustine’s *Sermon Against Jews, Pagans, and Arians*.<sup>42</sup> The latter passage may have been taken from other sources that quote it, such as Gregory the Great,<sup>43</sup> Peter Damian,<sup>44</sup> Peter Lombard,<sup>45</sup> or Richard of St. Victor,<sup>46</sup> but it attests all the same to Honorius’s familiarity with church writings. Other references are specifically attributed to Solomon, among them a distorted version of Sirach (“It is better to

remain in caves with a bear and a lion than with a wicked woman”)<sup>47</sup> and another quotation that is not as readily identifiable (“There is only one God, the only power, the only faith”).<sup>48</sup> In addition, the angel Samael is said to have told Solomon, “I shall give this to your people Israel, and they shall similarly grant it to others.”<sup>49</sup> These phrases may simply be Honorius’s own innovations or remnants of other magical texts he had read. That they all appear in close proximity to one another suggests the possibility that this part of the text may represent an adaptation from another source. In any case, it is clear that Honorius had a solid knowledge of magical texts. This is certainly true of the redactor, who had access to a glossed version of the *Arts notoria* at the time he copied the *Sworn Book*.

From this internal evidence, it is safe to assume that the original author and the redactors were members of the learned clergy and thus belonged to the “clerical underworld” identified by Kieckhefer.<sup>50</sup> While increasing evidence suggests that such magicians need not be imagined as solitary figures whose magical pursuits were unknown to others,<sup>51</sup> it is nonetheless difficult to say much more about Honorius, except perhaps in terms of geography. Veenstra’s essay establishes Spain as the most likely place of original composition, and this theory appears to be supported by the known movement of the text. In a trial from 1347, we learn that Berengario Ganell, who was from Spain, personally sold Étienne Pépin a copy of the book near Perpignan sometime between 1324 and 1344.<sup>52</sup> Pépin responded in the trial that he had recently sent the book to Guarino de Castronovo in Vabres (Haute-Loire).<sup>53</sup> Although this is our clearest indication of the movement of the text from Spain to France, we cannot rule out the likelihood that other copies were already in circulation (indeed, we can imagine that this was not the only copy Ganell sold). In fact, Pépin claimed to have heard of the book before acquiring his own copy. Next, there is an indication in the writings of the inquisitor Nicholas Eymeric that a copy was found in Aragon at some point between 1357 and 1375. It was not until 1389, and again in 1398, that the *Sworn Book* was finally mentioned in Paris.<sup>54</sup> There is not enough evidence to conclude with certainty which version was present in the former case, but the 1398 account refers to the prologue and other contents of the London version.

We may never know the identity of Honorius or the exact circumstances of the *Sworn Book*’s composition, but much can still be gained from a textual study. The history of medieval Christian magic has been a growing field over the past few decades, but angel magic has until recently remained a largely overlooked aspect of the tradition.<sup>55</sup> The reigning narrative in the historiography of angelic invocations in late antiquity is that early Christians condemned invocations to angels in order to avoid idolatry and to distance themselves from the practices of so-called Gnostic groups.<sup>56</sup> This particular concern is addressed by the fourth-

century Council of Laodicea.<sup>57</sup> As the story goes, this mentality changed in the fourth to sixth centuries, owing mostly to Augustine and Gregory the Great; as one historian asserts, “the invocation of angels has been a legitimate Christian practice ever since.”<sup>58</sup> None of these studies accounts for the consistently non-Christian character of the angels invoked in magical contexts, or for the repeated condemnations of such angelic invocations that recur throughout the Middle Ages.

In the most systematic treatment of early medieval angelic invocations to date, Valerie Flint provides numerous examples to argue that the practice was intentionally—almost officially—adapted in the early Middle Ages in order to preserve pagan spirit magic in a Christian form.<sup>59</sup> Her examples tend to focus on prayers, pilgrimages, sacramental practices, and the cult of Saint Michael, the archangel. Contemporaries, however, would have characterized the healings and other effects resulting from these practices as “miracles.”<sup>60</sup> Thus, while Flint is helpful in illuminating the early medieval Christian contexts in which angels were invoked, her work does not cast a direct light on the angelic texts of ritual magic that began to flourish in the thirteenth century. I argue that late medieval angel magic did not grow solely out of Christian practice, for aspects of it inherently contradicted Christian understandings of both angels and magic. Rather, it was the result of Jewish and, later, Islamic influence. Initially, this influence can be seen in rather isolated cases, which did not result in a continuing textual tradition of learned angel magic within Christianity. But once Hebrew and Arabic magical texts became available in the Latin West, largely through Spain and Sicily, Christian magicians such as Honorius began to adapt the use of different kinds of angels into their own treatises of practical magic.

### 3. Conjuring Spirits

The notion of commanding spirits had original grounding in the synoptic Gospels’ accounts of exorcisms, which continued to be sanctioned for expelling demons from those thought to be possessed. It is little wonder, then, that medieval clerical necromancers adapted the same beliefs and rituals in hopes of compelling demons to grant other kinds of requests.<sup>61</sup> In this respect the *Sworn Book* is no exception, for Honorius repeatedly asserts the same general assumptions about God’s willingness to constrain spirits on behalf of humans. What makes the text so remarkable, however, is the appropriation of these same formulas with regard to spirits that he specifically identifies as angels. In addition, the unusual length, complexity, and details of the operations reveal certain elements influenced by the Jewish and Islamic magical traditions.

Perhaps the most important text of Christian angel magic to emerge in Europe in the period preceding the *Sworn Book* was the *Ars notoria*. As mentioned earlier, the first section of the London version of the *Sworn Book* relies on many prayers copied verbatim from the later glossed version of the *Ars notoria*.<sup>62</sup> Thus, before undertaking a detailed analysis of the conjurations in the *Sworn Book*, it is important to establish the extent to which the types of angelic invocations used in the *Sworn Book* are intrinsically similar to that of the *Ars notoria*.<sup>63</sup> In the London version of the *Sworn Book*, the majority of angelic invocations drawn from the *Ars notoria* are addressed to God but call indirectly upon the power of the angels. Only rarely are the angels addressed more directly, as when the text reads, “Be present, holy angels, pay heed, and inform me whether such person shall recover or die of this illness.”<sup>64</sup> But even this statement could easily be understood as beseeching, rather than commanding, the angels.

Julien Véronèse is correct, then, in asserting that the *Ars notoria* lacks an overt notion of constraint.<sup>65</sup> In the first section of the *Sworn Book*, most directly dependent on the *Ars notoria*, God is entreated “by your most holy angels,” “by all your holy and glorious archangels,” “by the virtue of your holy angels and archangels,” “by the sight of your angels,” “by the power . . . of your holy angels,” “by these precious sacraments of your angels,” and “by your angels and archangels, by the thrones and dominations, powers, principalities and virtues, by the cherubim and seraphim.”<sup>66</sup> Only one invocation in this section of the *Sworn Book* lacks direct precedent in the *Ars notoria*: “by the intercessions . . . of your angels and archangels Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, and Raphael, and all other celestial angels.”<sup>67</sup> It is worth noting that in all of these instances the text is referring to the “celestial” angels—that is, those of the nine orders, who, Honorius insists, “serve only God” and thus cannot be invoked or compelled.

There are, however, three other types of angels: a lower group of celestial (or “planetary”) angels, “aery” angels, and “terrestrial” angels.<sup>68</sup> The following sections of the *Sworn Book* provide detailed instructions for conjuring and subjugating each of these types of angels, thus presenting a radical departure in premise from the prayers of the *Ars notoria* preserved in the first section. As will be seen, the mode of address to these types of spirits differs clearly from the address to the higher celestial spirits and from the *Ars notoria*.

A common form of necromantic conjuration, as Richard Kieckhefer has demonstrated, consists of four main parts: an assertion of the conjuration (“I conjure you”), a reference to the identity of the spirits who are being addressed, a listing of the various powers invoked to constrain the spirits, and specific instructions for the spirits to carry out.<sup>69</sup> The conjurations in the *Sworn Book* certainly follow this general pattern. As is typical, they are also accompanied by the performance of a prescribed ritual procedure. The simplest version of this

operation is found in the second section, which describes the procedure for conjuring those celestial angels who are associated with the planets, the sun, and the moon. The practitioner must first learn about the angels he wishes to conjure, prepare a magic circle,<sup>70</sup> conduct the ritual to determine whether he has God's permission to continue, and then spend several weeks attending masses and performing purification rites. During this time he persuades a priest to say prayers on his behalf beseeching Christ to constrain the angels.<sup>71</sup> After the purification is complete, the three-day conjuration process begins. On the first day he should attend Mass, say certain prayers, and perform a benediction at the circle. On the second day he attends Mass again and performs certain benedictions and suffumigations at the circle. Then he addresses the angels by name, seeking to pacify them: "In doing this [i.e., suffumigating], I offer you a small gift, so that you will be peaceful, patient, and calm, and will, by the intercession of God, kindly grant that which I seek."<sup>72</sup> Next, he draws two circles on the ground, inscribes the names of the angels around them, and then addresses the angels again: "Come, all you, N. . . . I invoke you, N., as Zebedee ordered his sons to obey, [so too] may you come."<sup>73</sup> On the third day he must wash and return to the circle with the seal of God. There he recites prayers and performs suffumigations and genuflections. Addressing God, he adds, "May I be worthy to join in a friendly manner with your holy angels, who may, with your kind permission, be willing to thoroughly fulfill my just desires."<sup>74</sup> He is now ready to begin the conjuration proper.

The text separates the ritual into four parts: the "invocation," the "seal and binding," the "conjuration," and the "placation." Each consists of instructions, such as holding up the seal or drawing a cross on the ground, as well as numerous permutations of verbal formulas that follow Kieckhefer's framework. The angels are addressed by long lists of names, various powers—often God's name—are called upon to constrain them,<sup>75</sup> and they are instructed to be peaceful, honest, and obedient. There is an implicit danger in the operation, and the angels are enjoined to descend into the circle without malevolence, taking on a beneficent appearance and a pleasing demeanor.<sup>76</sup> Further, the sigil of God is said to help "render them harmless."<sup>77</sup> When they arrive, the practitioner is cautioned, the angels are not to be seen or addressed until after they have first spoken.<sup>78</sup> No explanation of this practice is given. These angels are then constrained to obey the conjurer's wishes: "Ask what you want, and you shall have it."<sup>79</sup> In theory, these angels will obey only "lawful and upright" requests.<sup>80</sup> Honorius offers such suggestions as seeking knowledge of heaven, changing day into night or night into day, or consecrating a book.<sup>81</sup> However, previous descriptions of the angels indicate that some of them, in fact, specialize in harmful or questionable activities.<sup>82</sup>

The conjuration of the airy angels in the third section of the *Sworn Book* follows the same pattern, although it is longer and more complicated. There are, for

example, spirits of the winds and a set of demons that must be invoked as part of the operation, and they too are constrained by various powers.<sup>83</sup> This may be one reason why the text expresses a heightened sense of fear and danger. For example, the priest's prayer on the practitioner's behalf enjoins Christ to constrain these angels to appear "without harm to body or spirit."<sup>84</sup> The preparation for the conjuration also reveals this sense of danger, as extra rituals for protection are required.<sup>85</sup> As for the angels, they are asked to take not just a pleasing form but one that is not offensive, dangerous, or frightening.<sup>86</sup> And while correct performance of the ritual means that they will ultimately come and grant requests, they will first try to frighten the conjurer with various visions.<sup>87</sup> The conjuration for the fourth group, the terrestrial angels, further reinforces this element of danger.<sup>88</sup> Although Honorius never explicitly states the reason for this danger, the apparent implication is that the spirits themselves (angels and demons alike) are the source of the danger. And, more explicitly than in the case of the planetary angels, both the airy and the terrestrial angels can be summoned for overtly harmful purposes.<sup>89</sup>

At one point, however, there is a rather distinctive change in the form of the conjuration. In the ritual for summoning the airy angels, an additional step requires that the practitioner rouse certain demons who are associated with the seven planets and directions. This conjuration begins by calling out cycles of questions to them: "Where is King Harthan and where are his attendants Bileth, Mylalu, and Abucaba? Where is King Abaa and where are his attendants Hyici, Quyron, Zach, and Eladeb? Where is King Maymon and where are his attendants Assaabi, Albunalich, Haibalidech, and Yasfla?"<sup>90</sup> As Gershom Scholem has noted, this form of indirect invocation may be found with some frequency in Islamic magical texts, but it is quite rare in Jewish sources.<sup>91</sup> Nor is this formula common in Christian texts, where the wording of invocations closely resembles that of Jewish magic.<sup>92</sup> The inclusion of this form, then, indicates a nearly certain case of borrowing from an Islamic source. In addition, the demon kings mentioned bear a striking resemblance to the Islamic tradition of the seven demon kings, who are also associated with the planets and directions. Some onomastic similarities further support this particular influence.<sup>93</sup>

Another element reminiscent of Islamic tradition is the requirement to learn the angels' particular characteristics as a prerequisite to performing the ritual.<sup>94</sup> In general, the Islamic magical tradition is often highly theoretical in focus. Treatises of magic tend to explain how and why magic functions, and it is through this knowledge that one is able to operate the magical arts.<sup>95</sup> Thus the knowledge of a spirit's properties is a crucial prerequisite for any invocation.<sup>96</sup> In Jewish tradition, however, magic is primarily performative, accomplished through the power of words and actions.<sup>97</sup> But while such a distinction is provocative, it is

certainly insufficient to draw stable conclusions about the specific influences on the rituals of the *Sworn Book*. After all, a learned magician, familiar with both church liturgy and Scholastic theology, could certainly incorporate elements of theory and ritual into a magical text. What is more conclusive, however, is the conception of the angels themselves.

#### 4. Envisioning Spirits

Christians in the later Middle Ages still understood angels mainly according to the sixth-century conceptions of Pseudo-Dionysius and Gregory the Great, in which angels remained abstract, uncountable, and largely anonymous.<sup>98</sup> With the exception of the archangels Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, the angels of the celestial hierarchy were perhaps too abstract to rival the saints as personal intercessors. In addition, the veneration of angels could easily arouse suspicions of *latrīa*.<sup>99</sup> This is not to suggest that medieval Christianity lacked a rich tradition of angelology—far from it, as David Keck has shown.<sup>100</sup> Nevertheless, there is little precedent for the *Sworn Book*'s ideas amid the various depictions of angels that flourished in monastic writings, Scholastic theology, biblical commentaries, sermons and exempla, eschatological writings, vernacular literature, and even visionary accounts, all of which tend to situate even the most exotic ideas about angels within accepted frameworks.<sup>101</sup> The angels portrayed by Honorius, however, not only differ strikingly from these traditional Christian conceptions but actually exemplify distinctive characteristics of Jewish and Islamic angelologies.

As we have already seen, angels in the *Sworn Book* are separated into four different groups. The first consists of the celestial spirits that are associated with the traditional celestial hierarchy, albeit presented in an unusual order. The author explains, “Certain of them serve God alone, and these are the nine orders of angels: cherubim, seraphim, thrones, dominations, virtues, principalities, powers, archangels, and angels.”<sup>102</sup> As presented, these angels correspond somewhat to orthodox notions of angels. Although they exist in a constant state of praise for God and cannot be conjured or compelled in any way, their power can still be invoked in supplication to God or even when conjuring other types of angels.<sup>103</sup> Since the portrayal of these angels in the London version of the *Sworn Book* is copied largely verbatim from the *Ars notoria*, it cannot provide much evidence for Honorius's adaptation of Jewish and Islamic sources. More revealing, however, are the angels described in the other sections of the work.

The second group of angels in the *Sworn Book* is composed of the celestial spirits of the planets. Each planet has a corresponding group of named angels, whose various character traits are specified. These include the angels' function,

region, body, color, and shape.<sup>104</sup> The functions indicate, for example, that the spirits of the moon change desires and thoughts, speed up journeys, and cause rain, while the regional attribute associates them with one of seven geographical divisions.<sup>105</sup> The other characteristics all relate to physical appearance, as when the spirits of Jupiter are described as being “of medium height,”<sup>106</sup> and those of Mars are colored “red, like burning coal.”<sup>107</sup> Each group of angels has three to five demons beneath it. Of these demons, one is the king and the rest are attendants.<sup>108</sup> These demons rule over the rest of the planets' demons.<sup>109</sup> In general, the planetary angels “esteem men” and should be considered good.<sup>110</sup> However, their descriptions call these assertions into question. The angels of Mars, it is said, “provoke wars, killing, destruction, and the death of men and animals,”<sup>111</sup> while those of Saturn are even said to cause sadness, anger, and hatred.<sup>112</sup>

The angels in the third group are known as airy spirits. This is a dangerous assertion, as the Christian tradition had long considered spirits of the air demons.<sup>113</sup> The author explains, “There are spirits in the air whom the holy mother Church calls damned, but these spirits claim that the opposite is true; thus we prefer to call them neither good nor evil.”<sup>114</sup> That said, he proceeds to explain that there are actually several types of airy spirits. Those associated with the east and west are benevolent, for “their activities aid in good, and scarcely harm anyone.”<sup>115</sup> The spirits of the north and south, however, are evil, and their works are harmful.<sup>116</sup> Finally, there is a third group, corresponding to three of the ordinal directions, which truly are “neither good nor evil,” since these spirits simply obey whatever invocations are addressed to them. Like the planetary angels, these angels of the seven directions<sup>117</sup> preside over demonic hierarchies, but they differ in that they also rule over spirits of the winds. They are likewise described in terms of function, region, body, color, and shape. In this case, however, new characteristics are included, such as their faces, manner of movement, and signs. The signs are indications that the angel is present, as when the conjurer sees men being eaten by lions in order to signify the presence of a southeastern spirit.<sup>118</sup>

Only a few details are provided about the last group, the terrestrial angels. The author explains that they are “filthy and full of all depravity.”<sup>119</sup> Their functions include such activities as killing trees and crops, causing earthquakes, destroying the foundation of cities, and ruining men.<sup>120</sup> These angels are large and frightening, with claws, five faces, and diverse animal body parts.<sup>121</sup> They too are arranged in a hierarchy, with one king and four attendants, each of whom commands legions that in turn rule over groups of more than four thousand demons.<sup>122</sup> The particular sign indicating their arrival is that “the entire world appears destroyed.”<sup>123</sup> In fact, these creatures are said to be so frightening that Honorius recommends leaving a written request in order to avoid seeing or hearing them!<sup>124</sup>

Such conceptions of angels are not the product of Honorius's imagination, nor can they all be attributed to the influence of other Christian texts of angel magic, such as the *Ars notoria* or the *Holy Almandal*.<sup>125</sup> Rather, they have strong roots in Jewish tradition. During the intertestamental period, Judaism began to develop a highly personalized conception of angels that differed significantly from the Hebrew Bible's portrayal of nondescript emissaries.<sup>126</sup> This new conception grants individual angels a unique and powerful name, a personality, a detailed physical appearance, and specific functions in the world. These angels tend to be arranged in numbered groups and placed within complex hierarchical systems. Although they are hierarchically superior to men, angels are thought to have significant contact with the human world, sometimes in the role of teachers. They also display an affinity with humanity in their ability to perform both good and evil works. While this new notion of angels was by no means universally accepted,<sup>127</sup> it is the dominant conception of angels in those texts of Jewish magic and mysticism that influenced Christian angel magic.

One of the earliest and most influential examples of this angelology is 1 Enoch, composed sometime between the second century BCE and the first century CE.<sup>128</sup> This pseudepigraphal apocalypse includes the account of a group of angels who decide to take human wives. They teach men the secrets of transmutation, incantations, astrology, and various other illicit practices, and the children born to their human wives become demons (1 En. 6–8, 15). The leaders of these fallen angels are listed by name, as are the archangels and various others that appear throughout the story.<sup>129</sup> Knowledge of these names can in some cases give someone power over these angels (69:14).<sup>130</sup> Each angel also has its place in a complex hierarchy of leaders and subordinates. Though a full description of this hierarchy is absent from the text, the number of angels that compose various groups is often specified. For example, the fallen angels number two hundred, twenty-one of whom are leaders (6:6, 69:2). Elsewhere, hierarchies are arranged in groups of three, four, twelve, 360, and one thousand (82:11–20). Even when a multitude of angels is considered infinite, numerical language is used, as when the text speaks of "a hundred thousand and ten million times a hundred thousand angels" (71:13).<sup>131</sup>

The individualized nature of the angels in Judaism meant that there was often a fine line between angel and man: the Essenes at Qumran viewed their community as a direct parallel to their idea of angelic priesthood;<sup>132</sup> several texts of antiquity and late antiquity attest to righteous humans as having initially been, or having become, angels;<sup>133</sup> and themes of affinity and rivalry between humans and angels are common throughout rabbinic literature.<sup>134</sup> There is even some evidence that Jewish "cults of the angels" may have existed.<sup>135</sup> It was during these early centuries of the common era that a loosely related corpus of Jewish writings began to focus on Ezekiel's vision of the flying chariot.<sup>136</sup> A major theme of this

literature is the human's journey through the celestial palaces, ultimately arriving at the throne of God. Writings connected to this tradition are commonly known as *Hekhalot* ("palaces") literature.<sup>137</sup> These texts represent centuries of composition, redaction, and fluctuation<sup>138</sup> and are far from uniform in their content.<sup>139</sup> But if the diverse characterizations of angels cannot present a unified angelology, the literature is all the more relevant for the broad range of conceptions it provides.

The depiction of angels in terms of names, numbers, ranks, hierarchies, and functions is well represented in *Hekhalot* literature.<sup>140</sup> There are, however, additional parallels to the angelology of the *Sworn Book* that are remarkable for their similarity in detail. To compare just one set of passages, known collectively as *Hekhalot Rabbati*, there are examples similar to the use of a seal containing God's name,<sup>141</sup> to the description of specific signs that indicate the presence of an angel,<sup>142</sup> and to the portrayal of angels as frightening, angry, or even violent.<sup>143</sup> There is also a strong emphasis throughout the literature on invocations and rituals for conjuring angels, in which these spirits are expected to reveal secrets, teach Torah, answer questions, provide revelations in dreams, and initiate mystical experiences.<sup>144</sup> It is notable that one of the predominant elements of these conjurations is a strong emphasis on the need to perform them in a state of ritual and ascetic purity.<sup>145</sup>

The emphasis on invoking angels is also elaborated in a series of textual fragments that have become known as the *Sepher ha-Razim*, or *Book of the Mysteries*.<sup>146</sup> This work, which shares some themes with mystical *Hekhalot* literature, tells of the hierarchies of named angels that fill the seven firmaments of heaven. The reader is instructed in the appropriate way to conjure these angels, compelling them to carry out a range of activities, including healing the sick, predicting the future, causing humans to fall in love, and helping people win at horse racing. Some of them are even "prepared to torment and torture a man to death."<sup>147</sup> The moral ambiguity—or perhaps neutrality—of these angels is further indicated in that some are, by their very nature, angels of anger, wrath, fury, or destruction.<sup>148</sup> One group is said to "stand in terror, cloaked in wrath, girded with dread, surrounded by trembling."<sup>149</sup> And in some cases the text indicates that the same angels can be summoned for either good or evil.<sup>150</sup> The rituals for conjuration often must be performed with respect to specific times, days, months, years, and astrological bodies.<sup>151</sup> Certain rituals in the text are even aimed at conversing with the sun, the moon, and the stars, and there are indications that the various months, as well as the sun, are each ruled over by angels.<sup>152</sup> Again, the theme of ritual and ascetic purity is central.<sup>153</sup>

The work of tracing the spread of magical manuscripts throughout the Middle Ages is a monumental task, owing to the anonymous or pseudepigraphal

nature of most of the works, as well as to their particularly low survival rate.<sup>154</sup> Without more studies on magical codices and catalogues, such as those recently carried out by Frank Klaassen and Sophie Page, it remains nearly impossible to identify who was reading what particular text, in what place, and at what point in time. But if we cannot yet identify the exact points at which Christians may have come in contact with these ideas, it is nonetheless clear that such texts were in circulation during the Middle Ages. For example, much of the extant *Hekhalot* literature was preserved through the writings of the Haside Ashkenaz, an influential circle of Rhineland mystics who flourished during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.<sup>155</sup> Given the growth of Kabbalah in the same period, it is clear that a diverse array of Jewish magical and esoteric sources had spread throughout most of western Europe by the time of the *Sworn Book*'s composition.<sup>156</sup> The clear presence of these themes in works such as the *Sworn Book* indicates that Christians had a certain degree of access to such ideas. Further, the *Liber Razielis*, produced from Jewish sources at the court of Alfonso X around the third quarter of the thirteenth century, presents angels in ways consistent with the earlier Jewish magical texts discussed here. In fact, it even includes the *Sefer ha-Razim*.<sup>157</sup> Perhaps more than any other points of contact, the *Liber Razielis* surely played a large role in the Latin dissemination of Jewish angel magic.

There is more knowledge of the particular Arabic magical texts that were translated and circulated in the late medieval Latin West.<sup>158</sup> These types of texts, often with Neoplatonic and astrological influences, were also important for the angelology of the *Sworn Book*.<sup>159</sup> Indeed, they were fundamental in shaping the practice of astral magic and in defining the influential category of “natural magic.”<sup>160</sup> The most well known of such treatises is the *Picatrix*, which was translated from Arabic into Spanish and then into Latin in the mid-thirteenth century.<sup>161</sup> This book, intended as a thorough instruction manual in the magical arts, is largely representative of the genre, treating such topics as the houses of the zodiac, the construction of talismans, correspondences in nature, love spells, poisons, and the magical properties of herbs and gems.<sup>162</sup> Of particular interest is the focus on planetary spirits.<sup>163</sup> Each planet has several spirits, each with its own name, to which certain prayers are addressed.<sup>164</sup> The knowledge of these spirits, their properties, and their relations is crucial, as science and philosophy are seen as fundamental to carrying out magical practices.<sup>165</sup>

Another text that circulated widely is the *De radiis*, attributed to al-Kindi.<sup>166</sup> Like many of the works of magic that originated in Islamic environments, this text is focused largely on the philosophical underpinnings of the magical arts rather than on strictly practical instructions, in this case on the workings of magic through planetary influence and “stellar rays.” The sixth chapter of this treatise is specifically devoted to prayers and invocations, many of which are

directed to spirits and the planets. The spirits, though incorporeal, are able to affect the world through cosmic harmonies and sympathies, which presupposes a network of correspondences throughout the cosmos. The text also emphasizes the power of invoking the names of God. Unlike the *Picatrix*, however, the *De radiis* leaves all spirits and angels anonymous.<sup>167</sup>

A final representative example from the Islamic tradition is the *Liber antimaqis*, a text that also shows Hermetic influence and that is cited twice in the *Picatrix*.<sup>168</sup> This text specifically assigns a name to the spirit of each planet. Each one is described in terms of its related animals, colors, minerals, or herbs, and according to factors such as appearance, temperature, and odor.<sup>169</sup> The reader is instructed to recite lists of names, when the astrological conditions are appropriate, in order to conjure these spirits. One such list contains seventy-two names, which were given to men so that “whenever they wanted to do good or evil, a spirit would appear to them and carry out their wishes.”<sup>170</sup> A focus on names is found elsewhere in Islamic magic, as in the writings of al-Buni, where divine names are particularly prominent in magical operations.<sup>171</sup>

As in the works of Avicenna, angels in Islamic magic were reimagined as planetary spirits.<sup>172</sup> A sort of intellectual rigor and purity is necessary to communicate with them, somewhat parallel to the requirement for ritual purity in Jewish texts. Through sympathies, correspondences, or harmonies, these incorporeal beings can affect the world when invoked. While the power of names is not as prevalent as in Jewish tradition—indeed, many Islamic texts leave the spirits anonymous—it is not entirely absent.<sup>173</sup> Its presence in some cases may in fact be a result of Jewish origin, as these two traditions undoubtedly influenced or, in Steven M. Wasserstrom's terminology, “cross-fertilized” each other.<sup>174</sup> Nevertheless, this is the form in which the ideas circulated among the learned magicians of late medieval Latin Christendom, such as Honorius.

The chart below is intended as a general comparison of widespread Christian conceptions about angels with those found in Jewish and Islamic magical literature. It does not, of course, represent every variation to be found within these traditions.

## 5. Discerning Spirits

In 744, Saint Boniface convened a synod at Soissons to investigate a man named Aldebert, who was accused of spreading heresy throughout the region.<sup>175</sup> Among the charges against him, this self-styled prophet claimed to have received special grace and powerful relics from angels.<sup>176</sup> In addition, he was said to have composed a prayer depicting an unusual image of “the seventh throne above the

## Overview of Comparative Angelologies

	Latin Christianity	Jewish Magical Tradition	Islamic Magical Tradition
Number of angels	Infinite or unknowable.	Often countable. Numbered even when the intent is infinite (e.g., “thousand thousands”).	Infinite, countless.
Names of angels	Only Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael are known by name.	Every angel has a unique name. Knowledge of an angel’s name gives one power over the angel.	Often, though not always, anonymous.
Groups of angels	Nine-tiered hierarchies of Pseudo-Dionysius or Gregory the Great.	Angels arranged in various groups and hierarchies. Groups have individual angels as leaders.	Groups are based around planets, directions, regions, etc.
Traits	Impersonal, light, intellect, models of piety, symbolic, liturgical.	Individualized, anthropomorphic, liturgical, associations with days, months, planets, and the zodiac, material associations.	Planetary spirits, light, intellect, material associations, microcosm / macrocosm.
Distinctive functions or roles	Based on position in hierarchy.	Based on groups and particular roles within the groups. Individual angels are more specialized.	Based on particular corresponding associations.
Cults of the angels	Yes	Yes	No
Can humans become angels?	While the elect may come to occupy the same elevated status, most agree that their nature remains distinct.	Yes	No
Moral status of angels	Good	Ambiguous (an angel may be good or bad).	Neutral (angels act based on prevailing correspondences).
Angels as a source of knowledge?	Yes, but generally limited to their capacity as messengers of divine revelations.	Yes, particularly in Hekhalot literature.	No. Knowledge is first necessary in order to access angels (except for the story of Harut and Marut in the Koran II:102).

	Latin Christianity	Jewish Magical Tradition	Islamic Magical Tradition
Addressing angels	Prayer, generally directed to God.	Direct adjuration, often invoked by the power or name of God.	Direct adjuration, often invoked by the power or name of God.
Addressing demons	Direct adjuration, often invoked by the power of God.	Direct adjuration, often invoked by the power of God.	Direct or indirect adjuration. Indirect: “Where is the demon N?”

cherubim and seraphim” that conjured an unorthodox series of angels by name.<sup>177</sup> We may never know the precise source of Aldebert’s cosmology, but there are clear affinities with Jewish tradition. Of the angels mentioned, he refers to Uriel and Raguel, both of whom figure in *1 Enoch*.<sup>178</sup> This text, it is known, had reached Ireland by this time.<sup>179</sup> While no direct evidence is available, Aldebert may have—even if indirectly—come into contact with ideas from this or similar texts.<sup>180</sup> Whatever the origin of these ideas, they caused great concern, for authorities suspected that Aldebert was actually summoning demons. In a response to Boniface, Pope Zacharias wrote: “[he] declared that he knew the names of the angels, as you described in your letter; but we declare that they are names, not of angels but rather of demons.”<sup>181</sup> Aldebert was officially condemned as a heretic and taken into custody.

The following year, a Roman synod followed up on the matter. According to the acts of the synod, the bishops declared, “The eight names of angels which Aldebert calls upon in his prayer are not names of angels, except Michael, but rather of demons whom he has summoned to his aid. We, instructed by Your Apostolic Holiness and by divine authority, know the names of but three angels: Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, whereas he brought in the names of demons under the guise of angels.”<sup>182</sup> In the final decrees of the synod, Aldebert was convicted of “summoning demons to his aid under the guise of angels.”<sup>183</sup> Aldebert’s sentencing seems to have had little lasting effect, for his activities again drew attention two years later.<sup>184</sup> But the synod’s affirmation that Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael were the only angels known by name persisted much longer. It was soon codified in Charlemagne’s *Admonitio generalis* of 789<sup>185</sup> and again in a capitulary of Ansegisus in 827.<sup>186</sup> The sentiment carried on in the later Middle Ages, as did the accompanying suspicion of demons being summoned in the guise of angels.

If the practice of necromantic magic is essentially identical to exorcism, as Kieckhefer has argued, then it is hardly surprising that a parallel version of spiritual discernment came to play a role in regard to magic as well. In general,

“discerning spirits” referred to the process of determining whether someone was divinely or demonically possessed.<sup>187</sup> With respect to medieval magic, the analogous question was whether the spirits invoked were angels or demons. Although the spirits conjured were usually designated angelic, demonic, or neutral within the medieval magical tradition, Christian theologians looking at such texts generally presumed invocations of any sort to be demonic, even if the spirits were called angelic and even if the outcomes were beneficent.<sup>188</sup> As in Aldebert’s case, anything ostensibly angelic was simply suspected of deceit. When a text such as the *Sworn Book* proposed angel magic as a legitimate practice, distinct from demonic necromancy, it challenged the deep-seated assumptions that underlay medieval conceptions of magic.

Ultimately, both forms of spiritual discernment raised questions of authority. This connection is perhaps nowhere clearer than in the works of the theologian John Gerson, who served as chancellor of the University of Paris at the turn of the fifteenth century. By actively appropriating the authority to discern spirits in cases of revelatory possession, he effectively discredited female mystics who claimed that their experiences were divinely inspired.<sup>189</sup> In similar fashion, he also attempted to consolidate his authority of discernment regarding magical conjurations. But in this he was not alone, for much like Aldebert and Boniface, magicians and church authorities had long clashed over the discernment of spirits.

The *Ars notoria*, as noted above, was one of the earliest Christian texts of learned magic that made significant use of angels. This well-known treatise probably began to circulate in the twelfth century,<sup>190</sup> at just the time when Hebrew and Arabic translations were becoming available in Latin.<sup>191</sup> While it lacks the overt conjurations of the later *Sworn Book*, it is hard to deny that an implicit element of constraint underlies the assertions of guaranteed ritual efficacy in the text. Julien Véronèse suggests that this particular problem may be the reason why the text explicitly presents the work as sacramental rather than magical.<sup>192</sup> However, the “syncretic” nature of the angels, as well as their uncharacteristic prominence, kept the text firmly outside the realm of orthodoxy.<sup>193</sup> The authorities agreed, and the *Ars notoria* was repeatedly condemned throughout the following centuries.<sup>194</sup> Thomas Aquinas, who demonstrated familiarity with the text, condemned it for, among other things, suspicion of demonic conjurations.<sup>195</sup> Even John of Morigny, who had long experimented with the *Ars notoria*, eventually decried it: “It was twice revealed to me by all the angelic spirits that in this book’s prayers in outlandish tongues there was an invocation of malign spirits hidden so subtly and ingeniously that nobody in the world, however subtle he be, would be able to perceive it.”<sup>196</sup> John’s *Liber florum*, a text that claimed delivery at the hands of the Virgin Mary, freshly systematized the basic

principles of the *Ars notoria*.<sup>197</sup> He was sensitive to the problem of discerning spirits,<sup>198</sup> but it was not enough to remove the lists of *nomina ignota* and assert that his text was divine in both origin and effect; it too was determined to be heretical and sorcerous, and it was condemned at Paris in 1323.<sup>199</sup>

Being very familiar with the *Ars notoria*, the redactor of the London *Sworn Book* could scarcely have been ignorant of the grounds on which it had been condemned. His own text was at particular risk, given its dependence on the *Ars notoria* and its rather explicit instructions for conjuring spirits, but he continued to insist boldly on the legitimacy of such magic. In the prologue to the *Sworn Book*, he declares that the devil has manipulated church authorities into condemning magical conjurations. Honorius defends the practice “because it is not possible for a wicked and unclean man to work truly through this art, nor is man subjugated to any spirits; rather, these spirits are unwillingly compelled to answer to pure men and to carry out their wishes.”<sup>200</sup> Insisting on complete control over the spirits—just as in exorcism—was a standard way to defend necromantic practice. This may, however, be the first time this argument had been used to justify the subjugation of angels.

From the beginning, Honorius asserts that pagans and Jews can receive no benefit from the magical practices described in the text. When pagans try to perform such magic, he claims, they are deceived by the very spirits they attempt to conjure, who merely perpetuate the pagans’ bad faith in idolatry.<sup>201</sup> As for the Jews, their refusal to accept baptism has deprived them of the ability to conjure angels effectively.<sup>202</sup> Only Christians can successfully invoke angels or obtain a vision of God. With respect to the latter, the author explicitly states that firm adherence to the doctrines of the Catholic faith is a requirement for attaining the vision.<sup>203</sup> At the end of the work, he again explains that this book can be of no use to non-Christians.<sup>204</sup> Throughout it all, he implicitly defends the orthodoxy of this practice, incorporating masses and other aspects of traditional liturgy into the rituals, emphasizing moral and ritual purity, and even suggesting that the reader seek the assistance of a priest in carrying out certain parts of the rituals.<sup>205</sup>

Given the extent of Jewish influence on the *Sworn Book*, some of which may have been directly borrowed, it is difficult to imagine that even the original author was completely unaware of his Jewish sources. Kieckhefer has argued that the London version’s repudiation of the Jews serves to distance Honorius’s practices from Jewish ones, which he was more or less consciously adopting. In doing so, he obviates any charges of Judaizing and thereby retains part of his claim to the orthodoxy of this magic.<sup>206</sup> This thesis is supported all the more by the work of Veenstra, who has now shown that the redactor, responsible for adding or emphasizing many of the Jewish elements in the text, actually replaced

the original anti-Muslim polemics with anti-Jewish ones.<sup>207</sup> If Veenstra is correct in pointing to geography as a crucial determinant of emphasis, then this shift would further support the argument that the redaction took place outside Spain.

One of the most crucial aspects of the *Sworn Book*'s angel magic lies in the sharp distinctions that Honorius draws. First, he argues that the celestial angels of the nine orders cannot be conjured or commanded.<sup>208</sup> In short, the prayers that invoke them, derived from the *Ars notoria*, do not constitute any form of constraint. This key element is what separates the first part of the ritual—and, by implication, the entire *Ars notoria*—from the explicit conjurations that follow. Second, within these conjurations, he distinguishes and describes the various types of spirits involved: celestial planetary angels, airy angels, neutral airy spirits, demonic airy spirits, spirits of the winds, terrestrial angels, and demons. Having differentiated all the spirits, he can more clearly assert that the instructions in the text refer to the conjuring of angels. Thus, even in his discussion of the frightful and dangerous terrestrial angels, whose adjuration is strongly discouraged, Honorius still claims that these are angels, and he is careful to distinguish them from demons.<sup>209</sup> It is noteworthy, however, that in spite of the particular emphasis on angels, the *Sworn Book* is also a work of explicit demonic magic.<sup>210</sup> The belief that angels can be subjected and controlled clearly applies as well to demons, the conjuring of which is mentioned in the prologue<sup>211</sup> and as part of the conjuration for the airy angels.<sup>212</sup> Although the ritual detail in the *Sworn Book* suggests that it was a manual for practical use, these necromantic elements also underscore Honorius's claims for the legitimacy of invocative magic, whether angelic or demonic. But while he insists that most types of spirits can be subjugated by the pious magician, he nevertheless maintains the underlying assumption throughout the work that there is a rather clear difference between the conjuration of angels and demons.

It would appear that Honorius's proposed discernment was lost on zealous inquisitors and theologians. As early as 1347 the text was mentioned in a sorcery trial against the monk Étienne Pépin (also called Oliver Aquitard). Accused, among other things, of conjuring demons, Pépin affirmed that his magical practices involved the use of angel names. When asked specifically about a spirit mentioned in the *Sworn Book*, he also responded that it was an angel, not a demon.<sup>213</sup> The book also figures among the works of necromancy that Nicholas Eymeric condemns in his *Directorium inquisitorum* of 1376.<sup>214</sup> But the most explicit condemnation came at the end of the century. In 1398 the theological faculty of Paris, led by John Gerson, issued a condemnation of twenty-eight propositions related to magic, some of them clearly directed at practices found in the *Sworn Book*.<sup>215</sup> Among the errors listed are the beliefs that a vision of God

can be obtained through magic,<sup>216</sup> that neutral spirits exist,<sup>217</sup> that demon kings are associated with the directions,<sup>218</sup> and that the church's condemnations of magic are irrational.<sup>219</sup> In addition, the articles condemn the beliefs that ritual purity justifies sorcery<sup>220</sup> and that items such as hoopoe blood and virgin parchment have efficacy over demons.<sup>221</sup> With the exception of the specific references to hoopoe blood and to the church's condemnation of magic, all of these "errors" are probably the result of Jewish and Islamic practices that had been appropriated into Christian magic. Further, these condemnations reinforce the orthodox position against necromancy, asserting that God does not force demons to obey their conjurers,<sup>222</sup> that demons are not otherwise compelled to obey,<sup>223</sup> that summoning demons is inherently idolatrous,<sup>224</sup> and that it is the source—not the effect—that determines whether certain practices are licit.<sup>225</sup>

Finally, the condemnations answer the challenge posed by angel magic. They insist that acts of sorcery are not revealed to men by good angels,<sup>226</sup> nor do good angels perform activities related to magic,<sup>227</sup> and, most significantly, that the only sources of such power are God, nature, or demons.<sup>228</sup> Thus Honorius's claims are false: he may call the spirits angels but they are actually demons in disguise. While this position is certainly not new to this particular condemnation, the faculty's need to reiterate it reflects the increasing challenge that angel magic represented in this period. Just as Gerson worked to appropriate the authority of spiritual discernment in regard to female mystics—his first treatise on the subject, *De distinctione verarum visionum a falsis*, was written only three years after the Paris condemnation—so too did he strengthen his authority to declare all invocative magic demonic.

#### Epilogue: The "Christianization" of Angel Magic

And yet, the redefinition of magic proposed by the *Sworn Book* and other such treatises was not utterly futile. As works of angel magic continued to pass through the hands of theologians and inquisitors, it became more difficult to maintain a firm stance against all forms of conjuration. One need only mention such figures as Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499), Johannes Trithemius (1462–1516), Henry Cornelius Agrippa (1486–1535), and John Dee (1527–1608),<sup>229</sup> whose diverse forms of spirit magic—however much (or little) altered by Neoplatonism and Hermeticism—would flourish throughout the following centuries.<sup>230</sup> But before these figures, we find Antonio da Montolmo, who was a doctor and astrologer in Italy at the end of the fourteenth century. The importance of Montolmo and his writings has been emphasized by Nicolas Weill-Parot in several studies, which now include the edition of *De occultis et manifestis* that appears in this volume.<sup>231</sup>

In this work, Montolmo discusses the influences and magical operations relating to the hierarchy of angelic “Intelligences,” which consist of both good and evil spirits. Throughout, as Weill-Parot notes, Montolmo attempts to maintain an acceptable theological position by avoiding explicit conjurations of the highest Intelligences (tantamount to theurgy in Augustine’s sense), while remaining ambiguous as to the status of the lower “Altitudes.”<sup>232</sup>

By this point, however, the tradition of magic had begun to change. Montolmo’s portrayal of the Intelligences may have complicated received notions of magic by blurring the line between the role of impersonal astrological virtues and his ambiguously defined spirits, but the element of invocation is nonetheless present. That Montolmo openly acknowledged authorship of his works without suffering condemnation suggests that, at least in some learned circles, the invocation of good (or neutral) spirits was no longer met with instant skepticism that the spirits were really demons.<sup>233</sup> This is all the more surprising given the ambivalence of Montolmo’s position, which is perhaps best highlighted by a version of the same text that speaks explicitly of demons rather than Intelligences.<sup>234</sup> But the magicians, we might say, had won a partial victory. As traditions of Jewish and Islamic angel magic became entrenched in an ever growing body of Latin treatises, the idea of angel magic seems to have become distinct from demonic necromancy, no matter how thin the line between the two might have been.

As the narrative goes, I suggest, Christians of the early Middle Ages adopted the practice of angel magic through contact with Jewish and Islamic ideas. The lack of a textual tradition, however, kept the practice from developing within Christianity. But the increased accessibility of Jewish and Islamic texts after the twelfth century brought Christians into contact with new conceptions of angels. While such ideas may not have been so easily incorporated into orthodox theology, Christian magicians were willing to adopt the new practices. Whatever they may have thought of Jewish and Islamic doctrine, they nevertheless believed that Jews and Muslims possessed efficacious occult knowledge. And it was certainly easier to attempt to defend a work of angel magic, even by assimilation to natural magic, than one of overt demonic necromancy. The role of angel magic in the later Middle Ages is thus central to the trend that Claire Fanger has termed the “radical positivization of magic.”<sup>235</sup> As the growing popularity of these texts created a native tradition of angel magic within Christianity, both in Latin and in the vernacular, so too did it eventually change wider perceptions of the practice. By the fifteenth century angel magic was in many respects tolerated. Only the explicitly demonic forms of magic were still actively condemned.<sup>236</sup> Thus Jewish and Islamic angelologies, having entered Christianity through magical texts—a path of less resistance—had begun to change wider Christian conceptions of both angels and magic.

## NOTES

1. See, e.g., Peter Brown, “Sorcery, Demons, and the Rise of Christianity from Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages,” in *Witchcraft Confessions and Accusations*, ed. Mary Douglas (London: Tavistock, 1970), 17–45. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations in this chapter are my own.

2. Available English editions are *The Sworn Book of Honourius the Magician: As Composed by Honourius Through Counsel with the Angel Hocroell*, ed. Daniel J. Driscoll (Gillette, NJ: Heptangle Books, 1977); and *Liber Juratus, or The Sworne Booke of Honorius*, ed. Joseph H. Peterson, online at <http://www.esotericarchives.com/juratus/juratus.htm>. A critical edition is now available in *Liber iuratus Honorii: A Critical Edition of the Latin Version of the Sworn Book of Honorius*, ed. Gösta Hedegård (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 2002); references are to this edition.

3. “Vos igitur, potentes angeli, invoco et invocando coniuro. Superne maiestatis imperii potentes potenter imparo [sic; meaning impero] per eum . . . et per nomen eius ineffabile . . . quo auditu omnes exercitus celestes, terrestres et infernales tremunt et colunt, et per ista, que sunt Rethala, Rabam, Cau-thalee, Durhulo, Archyma, Rabur, quatinus a Saturninis, Iovinis, Marcialibus, Solaribus, Venereis, Mercurialibus, Lunaribus speris omni occasione et malivolencia cessante in forma benivola atque meo placati munusculo michi in omnibus licitis et honestis obedire parati . . . infra circulos hic circumscriptos descendere dignemini.” *Liber iuratus*, §LXV (Hedegård, 123).

4. As I discuss below, it remains difficult to draw a clear distinction between the original author and later redactors. As it is not my intention in this chapter to distinguish original text from redacted text, I avoid cumbersome caveats by using “Honoriu” as a general designation. In those instances where I wish to treat the original author or a redactor more specifically, I will so indicate.

5. See, e.g., Lynn Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 8 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1923–58); Charles Homer Haskins, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, 2d ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927); Charles Burnett, *The Introduction of Arabic Learning into England* (London: British Library, 1997); and David Pingree, “The Diffusion of Arabic Magical Texts in Western Europe,” in *La diffusione delle scienze islamiche nel Medio Evo europeo*, ed. Biancamaria Scaria Amoretti (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1987), 57–102.

6. For an account of the known manuscripts of Ganell’s text and the features that distinguish his *Sworn Book* from the London version, see Jan Veenstra’s chapter in this volume. An edition of Ganell’s *Summa sacre magice* is in preparation by Damaris Gehr.

7. For an account of the manuscript tradition, see the edition cited above, note 2.

8. *Liber iuratus*, §I (Hedegård, 60–61).

9. For more details on the differences between the traditions, see Jan Veenstra’s chapter in this volume.

10. For this position, see Thorndike, *History of Magic*, 2:281; Edward Peters, *The Magician, the Witch, and the Law* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978), 110–11; and Robert Mathiesen, “A Thirteenth-Century Ritual to Attain the Beatific Vision from the *Sworn Book of Honorius of Thebes*,” in *Conjuring Spirits: Texts and Traditions of Medieval Ritual Magic*, ed. Claire Fanger (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 146–47. For arguments supporting a fourteenth-century date, see Norman Cohn, *Europe’s Inner Demons: The Demonization of Christians in Medieval Christendom*, rev. ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 116; Richard Kieckhefer, “The Devil’s Contemplatives: The *Liber iuratus*, the *Liber visionum*, and Christian Appropriation of Jewish Occultism,” in Fanger, *Conjuring Spirits*, 253–54; Hedegård, *Liber iuratus*, 12–13; and Jean-Patrice Boudet, “Magie théurgique, angelologie et vision bénétique dans le *Liber sacratus sive juratus* attribué à Honorius de Thèbes,” in “Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge,” ed. Jean-Patrice Boudet, Henri Bresc, and Benoît Grévin, special issue, *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome: Moyen Âge* 114, no. 2 (2002): 853, 858–61. However, all of the evidence remains speculative.

11. Kieckhefer, “Devil’s Contemplatives,” 254.

12. Julien Véronèse, “L’Ars notoria au Moyen Âge et à l’époque moderne: Étude d’une tradition de magie théurgique (XIe–XVIIe siècle),” 2 vols. (PhD diss., Université Paris X–Nanterre, 2004), 1:243–44. See also Véronèse’s chapter in this volume. On the two glossed versions, see esp. 1:205–47. On the circulation of the unglossed version, see esp. 1:32–34, 36–43, and 107–15.

13. See Claire Fanger’s chapter in this volume.

14. Claire Fanger and Nicholas Watson have traced numerous quotations from the glossed version of the *Ars notoria* in John’s *Liber florum celestis doctrine*. While the *Liber florum* and the *Sworn*

Book share a common liturgical base and work with some of the same magical texts, including the *Ars notoria*, there seems to be no part of the *Liber florum* that can definitively be traced to the *Sworn Book* itself. Other magic texts cited include *De quattuor annulis Solomonis*, *Librum prestigiorum Abel*, *Librum de septem senatoribus*, *Librum de duodecim firmamentis*, and *Librum Semhemforas*. The *Sworn Book* is not mentioned. Claire Fanger, personal communication.

15. For manuscript dates, see Hedegård, *Liber iuratus*, 12–14. The *terminus ante quem* supplied by the earliest known manuscript of the London version is roughly coincident with that supplied for Ganell's version by the Pépin trial (1346). Boudet, "Magie théurgique," 853; Jan Bulman, "Notice of the *Liber iuratus* in Early Fourteenth-Century France," *Societas Magica Newsletter* 14 (Fall 2005): 4, 6, online at <http://www.societasmagica.org/>. Thus both versions must have been in circulation at the same time, though presumably in different areas of Europe.

16. See especially *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Hexenwahns und der Hexenverfolgung im Mittelalter*, ed. Joseph Hansen (1901; Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1963), 2–15; Thorndike, *History of Magic*, 3:18–38; Alain Boureau, *Satan hérétique: Histoire de la démonologie (1280–1330)* (Paris: Odile Jacob, 2004), 17–60; Alain Boureau, *Le pape et les sorciers: Une consultation de Jean XXII sur la magie en 1320* (Rome: École française de Rome, 2004).

17. Boudet suggests this connection in "Magie théurgique."

18. G. Mollat, *The Popes at Avignon, 1305–1378*, trans. Janet Love (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 21–22, 28.

19. Although the accepted position was that the blessed received the vision immediately after death, there is precedent for such an idea in mystical thought even as far back as Gregory the Great. See Cuthbert Butler, *Western Mysticism: The Teaching of Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard on Contemplation and the Contemplative Life*, 3d ed. (London: Constable, 1967), 87–92. Bernard of Clairvaux expressed a similar opinion in *De diligendo Deo*, chapter 11, in *PL* 182:993–95. For the most complete analysis of mystical ideas about the vision of God, see Bernard McGinn, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, 4 vols. to date (New York: Crossroad, 1991–2005).

20. The idea that the vision of God could be attained during life by one's own merits was particularly dangerous, as the Council of Vienne had condemned it among the errors of the Beghards and Beguins. "Quinto, quod quelibet intellectualis natura in se ipsa naturaliter est beata quodque anima non indiget lumine glorie ipsam elevante ad Deum videndum et eo beate fruendum." *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis neerlandicae*, ed. Paul Fredericq (Ghent: J. Vuylsteke, 1889), no. 172, 169. This condemnation followed on the heels of the burning, in 1310, of Marguerite Porete, who had expressed a similar sentiment in *The Mirror of Simple Souls*, esp. chapters 33 and 97.

21. On which, see Jan Veenstra's chapter in this volume.

22. The procedure is summarized in Hedegård, *Liber iuratus*, 30–36.

23. As Veenstra notes in chapter 4 of this volume, the earlier redaction also shows many of these signs of Jewish influence, though they are evident in different ways.

24. Richard Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 170; Kieckhefer, "Devil's Contemplatives," 253–57; Kieckhefer, "Did Magic Have a Renaissance? An Historiographic Question Revisited," in *Magic and the Classical Tradition*, ed. Charles Burnett and W. F. Ryan (London: Warburg Institute, 2006), 210.

25. "Set dicet aliquis: 'Cum Dominus dicat: Non videbit me homo et vivet [Ex 33:20], sequitur ergo, quod si quis Deum videat, oportet, quod in corpore moriatur. Ergo de cetero usque ad diem iudicii non resurget, quia nemo bis corpore moritur.' Set falsum est, quod quis in corpore in visione divina moriatur, set spiritus in celo rapitur, et corpus in terra cibo angelico reficitur." *Liber iuratus*, §CI (Hedegård, 114–15). The passage from Nachmanides is treated, albeit in a different context, in Elliot Wolfson's chapter in this volume.

26. There are references to the "celeste palacium" in *Liber iuratus*, §§XCVIII, CI (Hedegård, 108, 114). On the theme of the celestial palaces in Hekhalot literature, see Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1946), 49–54.

27. See Sophie Page's chapter in this volume.

28. Boudet, "Magic théurgique," 863–67. For further analysis, see Jan Veenstra's chapter in this volume.

29. Some of this evidence is discussed in Jan Bulman, "Contests for Power: Black Magic in Fourteenth-Century Gévaudan," paper presented at the Fortieth International Congress on Medieval

Studies, Kalamazoo, Michigan, May 7, 2005. I am grateful to Dr. Bulman for providing me with a copy of this paper. See also Bulman, "Notice of the *Liber iuratus*." Ganell's version of the *Sworn Book* provides further corroboration. See Jan Veenstra's chapter in this volume.

30. *Liber iuratus*, §§III, CXV (Hedegård, 66, 123).

31. *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXVII (Hedegård, 145). The letter "he" with a missing or poorly visible downstroke could be mistaken for a dalet. If a Jewish scribe was involved at some point in the text's history, the omission may have been intentional in order to avoid writing the tetragrammaton. In any case, it seems that only a Christian who knew no Hebrew beyond the alphabet could have transmitted such a mistake.

32. *Liber iuratus*, §§I, III, V, LII, C–CI, CXIV (Hedegård, 60, 66, 71, 92, 110, 112–15, 120, 123). Passages include Exod. 33:20; Deut. 6:16 (or Matt. 4:7); Pss. (Vulg.) 17:26, 50:9, 50:19, 77:1, 113:24, 115:10, 118:1, 144:18, 146:9; Matt. 4:21–22, 7:7, 18:19, 18:20; Mark 16:16; Luke 2:29–32, 12:37, 17:19; John 19:30; Acts 7:55; and Phil. 2:8, 2:10.

33. "Abrenuncio Sathan et omnibus pompis eius." *Liber iuratus*, §I (Hedegård, 60).

34. "Qui mortem nostram moriendo destruxit et vitam resurgendo reparavit." *Liber iuratus*, §III (Hedegård, 65).

35. *Liber iuratus*, §VII (Hedegård, 72).

36. *Liber iuratus*, §VIII (Hedegård, 72).

37. *Liber iuratus*, §XII (Hedegård, 74).

38. *Liber iuratus*, §XIV (Hedegård, 76).

39. *Liber iuratus*, §CI (Hedegård, 113).

40. *Liber iuratus*, §XIII (Hedegård, 74–75).

41. "Facito aliquid operis, ut te semper diabolus inveniat occupatum." Jerome, *Epistolae*, letter 125, PL 22:1078. Honorius's version reads, "Dicitur: 'Semper aliquid agite, ne ociosi inveniamini.'" *Liber iuratus*, §V (Hedegård, 71). It is not clear whether Jerome is the direct source of Honorius's altered quotation.

42. "Dic, sancte Daniel, dic de Christo quod nosti. Cum venerit, inquit, Sanctus sanctorum, cessabit uncio [cf. Dan. 9:24]." Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo contra Iudeos, paganos et Arianos*, chapter 12, PL 42:1124. Honorius's version reads, "Quando venit rex regum et dominus dominicum, cessabit uncio vestra." *Liber iuratus*, §III (Hedegård, 66).

43. Gregory I, *Commentarii in librum I Regum*, chapter 3, PL 79:461C.

44. Peter Damian, *Antilogus contra Iudeos, ad Honestum*, chapter 1, PL 145:46A; Damian, *Collectanea in Vetus Testamentum*, chapter 30, PL 145:1008A; Damian, *Expositio mystica historiarum libri Geneseos*, chapter 30, PL 145:856D; Damian, *Sermones*, sermons 1 and 25, PL 144:513C and 144:641D.

45. Peter Lombard, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, on Ps. 4:6 and Ps. 73:10, PL 191:86B and 191:687B.

46. Richard of St. Victor, *De Emmanuele*, chapter 14, PL 196:648D.

47. "Nam ut Salomon ait: 'Tucus est cum ursa et leone in cavernis morari quam cum muliere nequam.'" *Liber iuratus*, §V (Hedegård, 71). Cf. Sir 25:23: "commorari leoni et draconi placebit quam habitare cum muliere nequa."

48. "Dixit Salomon: 'Unus est et solus Deus, sola virtus, sola fides.'" *Liber iuratus*, §III (Hedegård, 65). The phrase is repeated later, with slight variation: "Inspirante Domino dixit Salomon: 'Unus est <et> solus Deus, sola fides, sola virtus'" (§IV, Hedegård, 70). Cf. Deut. 6:4 and Eph. 4:4–6.

49. "Dixit angelus Samael Salomoni: 'Hoc dabis populo Israel, qui et aliis similiter tribuent.'" *Liber iuratus*, §IV (Hedegård, 70). Note a similar notion in Hekhalot literature of passing esoteric knowledge to Israel as well as the gentiles, discussed in Peter Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism*, trans. Aubrey Pomerance (Albany: SUNY Press, 1992), 118–21.

50. Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 153–56.

51. John of Morigny, "The Prologue to John of Morigny's *Liber visionum*: Text and Translation," trans. and ed. Claire Fanger and Nicholas Watson, *Esoterica: The Journal of Esoteric Studies* 3 (2001): 113–15, online at <http://www.esoteric.msu.edu/VolumelII/Morigny.html>.

52. "Quo auditu, ipse loquens yvit per diversas regiones, dictum librum perquirendo, et tandem invenit ipsum in quadam castro vocato Trassore, proprie Pirpinhanum, cum quadam magistro in artibus vocato Berenguario Guanelli" Edmond Falgaïrolle, *Un envoiément en Gévaudan en l'année 1347* (Nîmes: Catélan, 1892), 68. This identification was first made by Jean-Patrice Boudet and Julien

Véronèse, "Le secret dans la magie rituelle médiévale," *Micrologus* 14 (2006): 141. The chronology of the transaction was clarified in Bulman, "Contests for Power."

53. Falgaïrolle, *Envoyément en Gévaudan*, 94.

54. The preceding instances are all examined in Boudet, "Magie théurgique," 853–55.

55. Notable studies include Valerie I. J. Flint, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); Fanger, *Conjuring Spirits*; Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, "Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge"; Nicolas Weill-Parot, *Les "images astrologiques" au moyen âge et à la renaissance: Spéculations intellectuelles et pratiques magiques (XIIe–XVe siècle)* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002); Véronèse, "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge."

56. This view dates back at least to an article by Joseph Turmel, "Histoire de l'angélologie des temps apostoliques à la fin du Ve siècle," *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* 3, nos. 4–6 (1898): 289–308, 407–34, 533–52. Some of the premises of Turmel's account were challenged a few years later by G. Bareille, "Le culte des anges à l'époque des pères de l'église," *Revue Thomiste* 8, no. 4 (1900): 41–49, though the narrative was not significantly altered. The basic premise is still widely accepted. See, e.g., Philippe Faure, "L'ange du haut Moyen Âge occidental (IVe–IXe siècles): Crédit ou tradition?" *Médiévaux* 15 (1988): 31–32.

57. "Quod non oportet christianos, derelicta ecclesia Dei, abire, et angelos nominare, et congregaciones facere: quae omnia interdicta sunt. Quicunque autem inventus fuerit occulte huic idolatriae vacans, anathema sit, quoniam derelinquens dominum nostrum Iesum Christum filium Dei, accedit ad idola." *Monumenta germaniae historica: Legum*, vol. 1, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz (Hannover: Hahn, 1835), 57n3 (canon 35).

58. "L'invocation des anges est désormais une pratique chrétienne légitime." Michel-Yves Perrin, "Rendre un culte aux anges à la manière des juifs: Quelques observations nouvelles d'ordre historiographique et historique," in Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, "Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge," 699.

59. Flint, *Rise of Magic*, 157–72. Flint summarizes, "Firstly, the old daemones are brought through, though in disguise, in angels as well as in demons. Secondly, angels in their new guises are used extremely forcefully as agents in the process of selecting that in the old magic which is to be welcomed in its Christian form, and in overcoming previous rejections" (160).

60. See Kieckhefer's critique of Flint's ambiguous use of the term "magic," in "The Specific Rationality of Medieval Magic," *American Historical Review* 99, no. 3 (1994): 828–32.

61. Richard Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites: A Necromancer's Manual of the Fifteenth Century* (Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton, 1997), 144–49.

62. Hedegård's edition attempts to note all of the borrowings, but Véronèse has shown that Hedegård did not base the comparisons on the glossed version of the *Ars notoria*, thus missing several passages. Véronèse has identified all of the passages in "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge," 1:243n71. With this information, it is possible to see that of Hedegård's ninety-nine divisions, which compose the first section of the *Sworn Book*, seventy-six of them are from the *Ars notoria* (§§XV–XVIII, XX–XLIX, LIX–XCIV).

63. Latin critical edition in Véronèse, "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge." All translations from the *Ars notoria* text are my own, based on this edition. For description and analysis of the *Ars notoria*, see also Véronèse's chapter in this volume. An inadequate early modern translation (without figures or glosses, thus not reflecting the most commonly circulated medieval version of the text) may be found in *Ars notoria: The Notory Art of Solomon, Shewing the Cabalistical Key of Magical Operations, The Liberal Sciences, Divine Revelation, and The Art of Memory. Whereunto is added An Astrological Catechism, fully demonstrating the Art of Judicial Astrology. Together with a rare Natural secret, necessary to be learned by all persons; especially Sea-men, Merchants, and Travellers. . . . Englished by Robert Turner* (London: J. Cottrel, 1657).

64. "Angeli sancti adestote, aduertite et docete me utrum talis conualescat an moriatur de ista infirmitate." Véronèse, "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge," 2:815, §29b. This passage is adapted in *Liber iuratus*, §§XXVII (Hedegård, 81): "angeli sancti, adestote, advertite et docete me et regite me ad visionem Dei sanctam pervenientiam."

65. Julien Véronèse, "Les anges dans l'*Ars notoria*: Révélation, processus visionnaire et angélologie," in Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, "Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge," 813, 815; Véronèse, "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge," esp. 1:569–70.

66. *Liber iuratus*, §§XXIV–XXV, XI, LVI–LVII, LXIX: "per sanctissimos angelos tuos" (Hedegård, 80); Véronèse, "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge," 2:808, §XXIV); "per omnes sanctos <arch>angelos tuos

gloriosos" (80/808, §XXIV); "per sanctorum angelorum et archangelorum tuorum virtutem" (80/811, §XXV); "per conspectum angelorum tuorum" (84/844, §LXIV); "per . . . sanctorum angelorum potentiam" (93/868, §CXXX); "per hec preciosa sacramento angelorum tuorum" (93/869, §CXXXIV); "per angelos et archangelos tuos, per tronus et <dominaciones>, potestates, principatus et virtutes, per cherubin et seraphin" (97/875, §CXLVI).

67. "Per intercessiones . . . angelorum tuorum Michaelis, Gabrielis, Urielis et Raphaelis et omnium aliorum celestium angelorum." *Liber iuratus*, §C (Hedegård, 109).

68. "Angelorum tres sunt modi, celestes, aerei, terrestres. Celestium duo sunt modi, quorum quidam derviunt Deo soli, et isti sunt 9 ordines angelorum, videlicet cherubyn, seraphin, troni, dominaciones, virtutes, principatus, archangeli et angeli, de quibus nec ex coacta virtute nec ex artificiali potentia inter mortales est loquendum, et isti nullatenus invocantur, quia magestatu divine continue laudantes assistunt et nuncquam ab eius presencia separantur." *Liber iuratus*, §III (Hedegård, 65–66).

69. Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites*, 127–42.

70. On magic circles, see *ibid.*, 170–76.

71. "Tu, domine Ihesu Christe . . . te suppliciter exoro, precor et postulo temet ipsum, quem nunc hic in manibus meis teneo pro famulo tuo N, ut ex dono ac permissione gracie tue omnes illos angelos, quos invocaverit, ut per eos benigniter consulatur, sibi mittere ac constringere digneris, ut te mediante possit cum ipsis misericorditer consociari." *Liber iuratus*, §CXII (Hedegård, 119).

72. "Ego igitur N, filius N et N, vobiscum humilis pacem do vobis. Faciens istud meum munusculum confero vobis, ut vos pacificati, pacientes et placati questiones, quas a vobis petiero, michi benigniter intercedente Domino faciat." *Liber iuratus*, §CXIV (Hedegård, 120).

73. Cf. Matt. 4:21–22. "Venite, vos omnes, N, ad pacem super sedem Samaym [Heb. "shamayim"] (?) quam precepit Dominus tribibus Israel ad exaltacionem laudis sue. Unde invoco vos, ut precepit Zebedei suis subditis obdiren, veniatis." *Liber iuratus*, §CXIV (Hedegård, 120). Conjunction by analogy to biblical stories is common in both Christian and Jewish magic. See Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites*, 140; Michael D. Swartz, "Scribal Magic and Its Rhetoric: Formal Patterns in Medieval Hebrew and Aramaic Incantation Texts from the Cairo Genizah," *Harvard Theological Review* 83, no. 2 (1990): 178.

74. "Ut tuis sanctissimis angelis valeam amicabiliter sociari, qui ex permissione tue dulcissime voluntatis mea velint iusta desideria penitus adimplere." *Liber iuratus*, §CXV (Hedegård, 121).

75. For example, "nomine illius Dei vivi et veri," "sigillo sactorum nominum Dei," "per ista sacra-tissima nomina," "nomine illius summi creatoris," "per alia Dei nomina pura," "per eius sacra nomina," "nomine vivi et veri Dei," "nomine ipsis," "per nomen eius ineffabile Tetragramaton," and "per nomen suum." *Liber iuratus*, §CXV (Hedegård, 121–24).

76. *Liber iuratus*, §CXV (Hedegård, 123).

77. "Hoc sacratissimum nomen ac sigillum tuum benedicere et consecrare digneris, ut per ipsum te mediante possim vel possit talis N celestes convincere potestates, aereas et terreas cum infernalibus subiugare, invocare, transmutare, coniurare, constringere, excitare, congregare, dispergere, ligare ac ipsis innocuos reddere." *Liber iuratus*, §IV (Hedegård, 71).

78. "Set non debent alloqui nec aspici, donec ipsi primo loquantur." *Liber iuratus*, §CXV (Hedegård, 124).

79. "Tunc pete quod volueris, et habebis." *Liber iuratus*, §CXV (Hedegård, 124).

80. The text specifies "in omnibus licitis et honestis" on three different occasions. *Liber iuratus*, §CXV (Hedegård, 122–23).

81. "Cognitionem celorum, si hanc quesivisti, vel mutationem diei in noctem et e contrario, si hoc petisti, vel consecrationem libri, si hanc voluisti, vel ultramque simul." *Liber iuratus*, §CXV (Hedegård, 123).

82. *Liber iuratus*, §§CV–CXI (Hedegård, 117–19).

83. For example, "summa Dei potentia," "angeli Domini," "sciencia Dei et sapiencia Salomonis," "sancta nomina Dei," "capud et corona principis vestri Belzebut," and "iudicium summi Dei tremendum." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXVIII (Hedegård, 132–33).

84. "Domine Ihesu Christe . . . peto te in hoc articulo . . . ut talis N ex dono ac tua voluntate sine dampnacione corporis et anime sibi spiritus N in omnibus subiciat, ut apparere, perficere, custodire, respondere eos ad omnia precepta constringat, ut sperat et desiderat. Amen." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXVII (Hedegård, 130).

85. "Nota, quod operans debet esse diligens, ut addat ista nomina aliis nominibus, quia durum est homini ignorantis virtutes spirituum et eorum malicias cum eis sine munitione maxima aliqualiter habitare, et assimilatur illi, qui vult debellare militem sagacem et ignorat arma eius et quis miles et que virtus militis, quem debellat." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXVII (Hedegård, 130).

86. "In forma N non nocentes alicui creature, non ledentes, non frementes, non furientes nec me sociosque meos vel aliquam creaturam terrentes, neminem offendentes." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXIII (Hedegård, 138–40).

87. "Et statim videbit eos in forma pulcherrima et pacifica dicentes: 'Pete quod vis. Nunc parati sumus quicquid preceperis adimplere, quia nos Dominus subiugavit.' Tunc pete quod vis, et tibi fiet vel aliis, pro quibus volueris operari." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXIII (Hedegård, 142).

88. *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXV (Hedegård, 142–44).

89. *Liber iuratus*, §§CXXVIII–CXXVI, CXXXV (Hedegård, 126–29, 142–44).

90. "Ubi est Harthan rex, ubi sunt Bileth, Mylalu, Abucaba eius ministri? Ubi est Abaa rex, ubi sunt Hyici, Quyron, Zach, Eladeb eius ministri? Ubi est Maymon rex, ubi sunt Assaibi, Albunalich, Haibalidech, Yasfla eius ministri?" *Liber iuratus*, §CXXIX (Hedegård, 135).

91. Gershom Scholem, "Some Sources of Jewish-Arabic Demonology," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 15 (1965): 1–13. In regard to a specific medieval Jewish magical text, he notes, "The Arabic character of the invocation retains its particular feature in that the typical exordial phrase of the actual call 'Where is the Demon N?' has here been retained, instead of the direct appellation customary in the Jewish formulas. This manner of addressing the demon, when found in Hebrew manuscripts, can always be taken as an indication of an original Arabic provenance" (6). In this article, Scholem is specifically referring to Islamic texts, not to Jewish texts written in Arabic.

92. Compare the forms given in Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites*, 131–32, with Swartz, "Scribal Magic and Its Rhetoric," 173–47. On adjurations in Hekhalot literature, see Schäfer, *Hidden and Manifest God*, 144–45.

93. Hans Alexander Winkler, *Siegel und Charaktere in der muhammedanischen Zauberei* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1930), 96–109. Of the seven, two sets of names appear directly related: Maymon/ Maimun and Barthan/Barkan. The four demon kings were known in Latin at least as far back as the 1230s, when they were mentioned by William of Auvergne, *De universo* II.3.7 and II.3.12.

94. "Habita igitur eorum secundum naturam, dominium, regionem et formam cognitione debita dum eos invocare volueris, sic facies." *Liber iuratus*, §CXII (Hedegård, 119).

95. See Toufic Fahd, "Sciences naturelles et magie dans 'Gayat al-hakim' du Pseudo-Mayriti," in *Ciencias de la naturaleza en al-Andalus: Textos y estudios*, vol. 1, ed. E. García Sánchez (Granada: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1990), 11–21. For notable exceptions, see the valuable studies of Pierre Lory, "La magie des lettres dans le *Sams al-ma'arif d'al-Buni*," *Bulletin d'Études Orientales* 39–40 (1989): 97–111, and "Anges, djinns et démons dans les pratiques magiques musulmanes," in *Religion et pratiques de puissance*, ed. Albert de Surgy (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1997), 81–94.

96. See, e.g., Toufic Fahd, "Le monde du sorcier en Islam," in *Le monde du sorcier: Égypte, Babylone, Hittites, Israël, Islam, Asie centrale, Inde, Nepal, Cambodge, Viet-nam, Japon*, ed. Georges Condominas (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966), 155–204.

97. See, e.g., Joshua Trachtenberg, *Jewish Magic and Superstition: A Study in Folk Religion* (New York: Atheneum, 1939), 114–31.

98. See, e.g., Barbara Faes de Mottoni and Tiziana Suarez-Nani, "Hiérarchies, miracles et fonction cosmologique des anges au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," in Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, "Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge," 717–51. This is not to say, however, that angels were infinite; they were just not counted or numbered. See, for example, Anselm of Canterbury, *Cur Deus homo*, book 1, §§16–18. Also, note Dante's remark that "the theologian for his part does not know how many angels there are, yet he does not engage in dispute about the matter." *Monarchia* 3.3, translation from *Monarchy*, trans. Prue Shaw (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 66.

99. Cf. Col. 2:18. Concern over the veneration of angels is treated throughout Bareille, "Culte des anges" and, more recently, Perrin, "Rendre un culte aux anges."

100. David Keck, *Angels and Angelology in the Middle Ages* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

101. For some of these views, see the essays collected in Isabel Iribarren and Martin Lenz, eds., *Angels in Medieval Philosophical Inquiry: Their Function and Significance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

102. Cf. *Liber iuratus*, §III (Hedegård, 65–66): "Celestium duo sunt modi, quorum quidam servunt Deo soli, et isti sunt 9 ordines angelorum, videlicet cherubyn, seraphin, troni, dominaciones, virtutes, principatus, potestates, archangeli et angeli, de quibus nec ex coacta virtute nec ex artificiali potencia inter mortales est loquendum, et isti nullatenus invocantur, quia magestati divine continue laudantes assistant et nuncquam ab eius presencia separantur." Of the other references to the hierarchy throughout the *Sworn Book*, some do not list the full hierarchy (§§IV, CI, CXXXVIII [Hedegård, 67, 114, 147]); others are based on an inconclusive arrangement from the *Ars notoria* (§§LXIX, CXXXIX [Hedegård, 97, 140]), and one places them in an even more unusual order (§CXXVII [Hedegård, 146]). Honorius thus does not clearly follow the hierarchies of Gregory the Great or Pseudo-Dionysius.

103. *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXIII (Hedegård, 140).

104. Cf. Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites*, 160–61.

105. *Liber iuratus*, §CXI (Hedegård, 119).

106. "Sua corpora sunt medie stature." *Liber iuratus*, §CVI (Hedegård, 117).

107. "Color eorum materialis est rubeus sicut carbones accensi bene rubet." *Liber iuratus*, §CVII (Hedegård, 117–18).

108. On the prevalence of demonic hierarchies, see Kieckhefer, *Forbidden Rites*, 155.

109. Boudet sees Byzantine influence in this hierarchy. See "Magie théurgique," 867.

110. "Homines et eorum naturam diligunt." *Liber iuratus*, §CIV (Hedegård, 117).

111. "Natura eorum est guerras, occisiones, destrucciones et mortalitates gencium et omnium terrenorum provocare." *Liber iuratus*, §CVII (Hedegård, 117).

112. "Eorum natura est tristicias et iras et odia promovere, nives et glacies concreare, et sua corpora sunt longa et gracilia, pallida vel flava." *Liber iuratus*, §CV (Hedegård, 117).

113. See Eph. 2:2. For the early history of this idea, see Richard P. H. Greenfield, *Traditions of Belief in Late Byzantine Demonology* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1988), 15–18. More important for the Latin West, however, this idea is developed throughout the works of Augustine. See, for example, *Confessions* 10.42; *City of God* 8.14–15, 8.22, 9.18, 10.21, 21.10; *De divinatione daemonum*, esp. chapter 3.

114. "In quo [aere] sunt spiritus, quos sancta mater ecclesia dampnatos appellat, set ipsi oppositum asserunt esse verum, et ideo eos neque bonos neque malos volumus appellare." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXVII (Hedegård, 125). The idea of neutral spirits was not common, though it existed in the Latin West. Marcel Dando has convincingly traced literary instances directly back to the *Navigatio Brendani*, in "Les anges neutres," *Cahiers d'Études Cathares*, 2d ser., 69 (Spring 1976): 3–28. Although Dando notes some possible precedents in the church fathers, it seems equally plausible that the ideas in the *Navigatio* are associated with the apocryphal Jewish texts that were available in Ireland at the time of its composition. See D. N. Dumville, "Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish: A Preliminary Investigation," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 73, sec. C, no. 8 (1973): 299–338.

115. "Boni, mites et fideles sunt illi orientales et occidentales et dicuntur boni, quia operaciones eorum iuvant in bono, et vix nocent alicui, nisi ad hoc cogantur divina virtute." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXVIII (Hedegård, 126).

116. "Mali sunt et cum superbia ferores australes et septentrionales et dicuntur mali, quia opera eorum sunt mala in omnibus, et nocent libenter omnibus et vix aliquid, quod sequatur, ad bonum faciunt, nisi ad hoc superiori virtute cogantur." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXVIII (Hedegård, 126).

117. Northeast is absent from the text.

118. "Signum eorum est, quod invocans, ut sibi videbitur, <videbis> iuxta circulum homines a leonibus devorari." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXIV (Hedegård, 128).

119. "De quibus spiritus breviter hic dicamus, qui sunt turpissimi et omni pravitate pleni." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXV (Hedegård, 142).

120. "Eorum natura est radices arborum et segetum exstirpare, thesauros occultos in terra custodire et conservare, terremotus facere, fundamenta civitatum vel castrorum destruere, homines in cisternis deprimere et cavernis, incarcerated temptare, homines destruere, lapides preciosos in terra occulitos adlibitum dare et nocere cuicunque." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXV (Hedegård, 142).

121. "Corpora eorum sunt ita grossa sicut et alta, magna et terribilia, quorum pedes sunt quilibet 10 digitorum, in quibus sunt unguis ad modum serpendum, et habent 5 vultus in capite; unus est bisonis, alter leonis, tercius serpentis, quartus hominis mortui lugentis et plangentis, quintus hominis incomprehensibilis. Duos tigrides gerunt in cauda. Tenent in manibus duos dracones. Color eorum nigerrimus omni nigredine inestimabili." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXV (Hedegård, 142–43).

122. "Corniger rex meridionalis, et habet 4 ministros in 4 mundi partibus . . . et quilibet habet legiones centum, et in qualibet sunt demones 4500." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXV (Hedegård, 143).

123. "Signum est, quod totus mundus videbitur destrui invocanti." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXV (Hedegård, 143).

124. "Set melius est scribere peticionem in tegula nova cum carbonibus et in eorum ponere circulo, et sic eos non audies nec videbis, et tum quicquid petitum fuerit facient in instanti." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXXV (Hedegård, 143).

125. On the latter text, see the articles by Jan R. Veenstra, "La communication avec les anges: Les hiérarchies angéliques, la *lingua angelorum* et l'élévation de l'homme dans la théologie et la magie (Bonaventure, Thomas d'Aquin, Eiximenis et l'*Almandal*)" in Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, "Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge," 773–812; "The Holy Almandal: Angels and the Intellectual Aims of Magic," in *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*, ed. Jan N. Bremmer and Jan R. Veenstra (Louvain: Peeters, 2002), 189–229; "Venerating and Conjuring Angels: Eiximenis's *Book of the Holy Angels* and the *Holy Almandal*; Two Case Studies," in Burnett and Ryan, *Magic and the Classical Tradition*, 119–34.

126. It has been suggested that the personalization of Jewish angels dates from the second century BCE. See George A. Barton, "The Origin of the Names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Apocalyptic Literature to 100 A.D." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 31, no. 4 (1912): 156. In the Hebrew Bible, the only named angels, Gabriel and Michael, are found only in Daniel (8:16, 9:21, 10:13, 10:21, 12:1).

127. Note the contrast, for example, of the philosophical hierarchy of angelic Intelligences in Maimonides's *Mishneh Torah*, *Yesodei ha-Torah* 2:7.

128. [Enoch], "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction," trans. Ephraim Isaac, in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985), 1:5–89. See, most recently, Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

129. See, e.g., 1 En. 6:7–8, 19:1, 20, 32:3, 40:9, 69:1–14, 78:1–2, 82:13–20. The naming of angels in Judaism has been the object of much research. Classic studies include Moïse M. Schwab, *Vocabulaire de l'angélologie d'après les manuscrits hébreux de la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1897); and Barton, "Origin of the Names of Angels." More recently, see Saul M. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1993), esp. 70–115; Henri Bresc and Benoît Grévin, "Introduction," in Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, "Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge," 589–615; Benoît Grévin, "L'ange en décomposition(s): Formation et évolution de l'onomastique angélique des origines au Moyen Âge," in Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, "Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge," 617–56.

130. The power of angelic names is emphasized in several late antique magical texts. See, e.g., *The Testament of Solomon: Edited from Manuscripts at Mount Athos, Bologna, Holkham Hall, Jerusalem, London, Milan, Paris, and Vienna*, ed. Chester Charlton McCown (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922). The best English translation is Dennis C. Duling's "Testament of Solomon: A New Translation and Introduction," in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:1935–87. While the existing manuscripts have been viewed as recensions of a rather unified treatise, recent scholarship has emphasized the underlying variety of textual traditions. See Sarah L. Schwarz, "Building a Book of Spells: The So-Called Testament of Solomon Reconsidered" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2005).

131. Cf. Dan. 7:10. Arnold Angenendt et al., "Counting Piety in the Early and High Middle Ages," in *Ordering Medieval Society: Perspectives on Intellectual and Practical Modes of Shaping Social Relations*, trans. Pamela Selwyn, ed. Bernhard Jussen (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 15–54, have argued that, in relation to the New Testament, numbers were meant to emphasize the inappropriateness of counting (16–17). I do not find this interpretation compelling in relation to magical texts, where numbers are often quite significant.

132. Devorah Dimant, "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community," in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*, ed. Adele Berlin (College Park: University Press of Maryland, 1996), 93–103.

133. James H. Charlesworth, "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*, ed. John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980), 135–51.

134. See, e.g., Jonah Chanán Steinberg, "Angelic Israel: Self-Identification with Angels in Rabbinic Agadah and Its Jewish Antecedents" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2003); Peter Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975).

135. Morton Smith, "A Note on Some Jewish Assimilationists: The Angels," in *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh II: New Testament, Early Christianity, and Magic*, ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 235–41, esp. 240–41. For a thorough account of accusations of angel veneration, see Perrin, "Rendre un culte aux anges."

136. Ezek., chapters 1 and 10. Ezekiel does not describe the spectacle as a "chariot," but the appellation was widely assumed in this literature. Cf. Sir 49:8. On the range of interpretations of Ezekiel's vision, see esp. David J. Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988).

137. The field of study was founded on Gershom Scholem's revolutionary analysis in *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 40–79, and his further work in *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, 2d ed. (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965). There is, however, little scholarly consensus about the extent to which this literature represents an actual mystical practice.

138. Peter Schäfer, "Tradition and Redaction in Hekhalot Literature," in Schäfer, *Hekhalot-Studien* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988), 8–16.

139. The Hebrew editions of the main European Hekhalot manuscripts are edited in Peter Schäfer, with Margarete Schlüter and Hans Georg von Mutius, eds., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1981). It is customary to cite all passages according to the section numbers in this edition.

140. The most comprehensive study of angels in Hekhalot literature is Schäfer, *Hidden and Manifest God*, which includes extensive examples of the portrayal of angels throughout the literature. See also Rachel Elior, "Mysticism, Magic, and Angelology: The Perception of Angels in Hekhalot Literature," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 1 (1995): 3–53.

141. David R. Blumenthal, *The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition*, vol. 1 of *Understanding Jewish Mysticism: A Source Reader* (New York: Ktav, 1978), 66–67, 71–72, 75. Schäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, §§219–23, 229, 231, 240.

142. Blumenthal, *Merkabah Tradition*, 64; Schäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, §215.

143. Blumenthal, *Merkabah Tradition*, 63, 67, 70–71, 83; Schäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, §§213, 224, 228–29, 259.

144. For a summary of themes, see Rebecca Macy Lesses, *Ritual Practices to Gain Power: Angels, Incantations, and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998), 85–101. On the tradition of summoning an angel to gain knowledge and memory, see Michael D. Swartz, *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

145. Lesses, *Ritual Practices to Gain Power*, 117–60; Michael D. Swartz, "Like the Ministering Angels": Ritual and Purity in Early Jewish Mysticism and Magic," *Association of Jewish Studies Review* 19, no. 2 (1994): 135–67; Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 153–72.

146. *Sefer ha-Razim: The Book of the Mysteries*, trans. Michael A. Morgan (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983). The Hebrew edition was *Sefer ha-Razim: A Newly Discovered Book of Magic from the Talmudic Period*, ed. Mordecai Margalioth (Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1966). It is now widely recognized, however, that these modern editions represent an artificial construction. Note that a new edition has been published by Bill Rebiger and Peter Schäfer, which takes into account the difficult textual history. See their *Sefer ha-Razim I und II*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009). I was not able to make use of this edition in writing this chapter.

147. Morgan, *Sefer ha-Razim*, 24–25, 29–31, 45–46, 64 (quotation on 25).

148. Ibid., 24–28. See Philip S. Alexander, "Sefer ha-Razim and the Problem of Black Magic in Early Judaism," in *Magic in the Biblical World: From the Rod of Aaron to the Ring of Solomon*, ed. Todd E. Klutz (London: T & T Clark International, 2003), 170–90. Alexander refers to this element as "moral and theological confusion" (179), and finds it "rare" because, he asserts, "The vast majority of early Jewish magic is apotropaic" (190). However, he notes, "It would certainly have been conceivable in the worldview of our author for angels to cause harm to humans, but they normally served in this capacity as agents of God, to punish men for some violation of the divine law. Here they are forced by a human to do harm, and there is no moral dimension to the ill that they are required to inflict" (179).

149. Morgan, *Sepher ha-Razim*, 44.

150. Ibid., 18, 22, 49, 70.

151. Ibid., 17, 23–24, 26, 30, 35–38, 41, 45–47, 51–52, 56–58, 62, 69–70, 74–75, 80.

152. Ibid., 36, 69–73.

153. Ibid., 18, 24, 28, 31, 41, 43–44, 46, 56–57, 59, 69–70, 75, 79.

154. Mathiesen, “Thirteenth-Century Ritual,” 143–44; Claire Fanger and Frank Klaassen, “Magic III: Middle Ages,” in *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism*, vol. 2, ed. Wouter J. Hanegraaff et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 729.

155. The classic study is Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 80–118, but see also Ivan G. Marcus, *Piety and Society: The Jewish Pietists of Medieval Germany* (Leiden: Brill, 1981).

156. See, e.g., the work of Ephraim Kanarfogel, especially “Traces of Esoteric Studies in the Tosafist Period,” in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Division C, vol. 2, *Jewish Thought, Kabbalah, and Hasidism* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1994), 1–8, and “Peering Through the Lattices”: *Mystical, Magical, and Pietistic Dimensions in the Tosafist Period* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2000). Also useful is Klaus Herrmann, “Re-written Mystical Texts: The Transmission of the Heikhalot Literature in the Middle Ages,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 75, no. 3 (1993): 97–116; and Daniel Abrams, “Ma’aseh Merkabah as a Literary Work: The Reception of Hekhalot Traditions by the German Pietists and Kabbalistic Reinterpretation,” *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 5, no. 4 (1998): 329–45.

157. In addition to Sophie Page’s chapter in this volume, see the important textual work on the Latin and Hebrew versions of the *Liber Razielis* in Reimund Leicht, *Astrologumena Judaica: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der astrologischen Literatur der Juden* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 187–294, 331–41. Note that the *Liber Samayn*, the sixth book of the *Liber Razielis* (and the most important chapter for angel magic), has now been edited from the Vatican and Halle manuscripts in Rebiger and Schäfer, *Sefer ha-Razim I und II*, 1:31–52, though, as noted above, I was not able to make use of this edition.

158. Some important primary sources on Arabic magic have been translated into French by Sylvain Matton, *La magie arabe traditionnelle* (Paris: Retz, 1976).

159. See the discussion of one such text, the *Liber de essentia spirituum*, in Sophie Page’s chapter in this volume.

160. Fanger and Klaassen, “Magic III: Middle Ages,” 726, 730. Arabic astrology also influenced wider Scholastic discussions of angels as “Intelligences.” See Keck, *Angels and Angelology*, 73, 85–86.

161. The Latin critical edition is *Picatrix: The Latin Version of the Ghayat al-Hakim*, ed. David Pingree (London: Warburg Institute, 1986). The best modern edition is *Picatrix: Un traité de magie médiéval*, trans. Béatrice Bakhouche et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), although a partial English translation can be found in William Kiesel, *Picatrix: The Goal of the Wise* (Seattle: Ouroboros Press, 2002). Introductory material from the German edition is still useful; see *Picatrix: Das Ziel des Weisen von Pseudo-Magrītī*, trans. Hellmut Ritter and Martin Plessner (London: Warburg Institute, 1962). For information on the Spanish translation, see David Pingree, “Between the Ghayat and *Picatrix* I: The Spanish Version,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 44 (1981): 27–56. On the influences of the *Picatrix*, see Hellmut Ritter, “Picatrix, ein arabisches Handbuch hellenistischer Magie,” *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* 1 (1921–22): 94–124; and David Pingree, “Some of the Sources of the Ghāyat al-Ḥakīm,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 43 (1980): 1–15. Also noteworthy is Jean Clam, “Philosophisches zu ‘Picatrix’: Gelehrte Magie une Anthropologie bei einem arabischen Hermetiker des Mittelalters,” in *Mensch und Natur im Mittelalter*, *Miscellanea Medievalia*, vol. 21.1, ed. Albert Zimmerman and Andreas Speer (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991), 481–509.

162. See Fahd, “Sciences naturelles et magie.”

163. But see Pingree, “Some of the Sources,” which privileges Jewish influence for planetary spirits.

164. Pingree, *Picatrix*, esp. 140–45. See also David Pingree, “Al-Tabari on the Prayers to the Planets,” *Bulletin d’Études Orientales* 44 (1992): 105–17.

165. See, e.g., Pingree, *Picatrix*, 3–7, 170–72; see also Fahd, “Le monde du sorcier en Islam,” 173–74; Fahd, “Sciences naturelles et magie,” 14–16.

166. Marie-Thérèse d’Alverny and F. Hudry, “Al-Kindi: De radiis,” *Archives d’Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Âge* 41 (1974): 139–260. See esp. Pinella Travaglia, *Magic, Causality, and Intentionality: The Doctrine of Rays in al-Kindi* (Florence: Edizioni SISMEL, 1999).

167. D’Alverny and Hudry, “Al-Kindi: De radiis,” 233–50, esp. 237, 245, 249–50.

168. Latin edition in Charles Burnett, “Aristoteles/Hermes: Liber antimaqvis,” in *Hermes latinus: Hermetis Trismegisti, astrologica et divinatoria*, vol. 4, ed. Gerrit Bos et al. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), part 4, 177–221. Cited as “Esternequis” in Pingree, *Picatrix*, 140, 146. See also the articles by Burnett, “Hermann of Carinthia and the *kitāb al-Isṭamātīs*: Further Evidence for the Transmission of Hermetic Magic”; “The *kitāb al-Isṭamātīs* and a Manuscript of Astrological and Astronomical Works from Barcelona (Biblioteca de Catalunya, 634)”; and “Scandinavian Runes in a Latin Magical Treatise,” all in *Magic and Divination in the Middle Ages: Texts and Techniques in the Islamic and Christian Worlds*, ed. Charles Burnett (Aldershot: Variorum, 1996).

169. Burnett, “Aristoteles/Hermes,” 202–3, 205–6.

170. “Et quandocumque uolebant facere bonum aut malum, apparebat eis spiritus et faciebat quicquid uolebant.” Ibid., 210–11.

171. Lory, “Magie des lettres,” 101.

172. Louis Gardet, “Les anges en Islam,” *Studia Missionalia* 21 (1972): 219–21.

173. Charles Burnett, “Remarques paléographiques et philologiques sur les noms d’anges et d’esprits dans les traités de magie traduits de l’arabe en latin,” in Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, “Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge,” 657–68. On the use of divine names in Islamic magic, see Lory, “Magie des lettres.”

174. See, e.g., Shaul Shaked, “Medieval Jewish Magic in Relation to Islam: Theoretical Attitudes and Genres,” in *Judaism and Islam: Boundaries, Communication, and Interaction: Essays in Honor of William M. Brinner*, ed. Benjamin H. Harry, John Lewis Hayes, and Fred Astren (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 97–109; Ignaz Goldziher, “Hebräische Elemente in muhammedanischen Zaubersprüchen,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 48 (1894): 358–60; Steven M. Wasserstrom, “Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Muslim Literature: A Bibliographical and Methodological Sketch,” in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. John C. Reeves (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), esp. 101–3; and Steven M. Wasserstrom, *Between Muslim and Jew: The Problem of Symbiosis Under Early Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); Wasserstrom discusses angels and magic in chapter 5 of this work.

175. On this case, see, notably, John Laux, “Two Early Medieval Heretics: An Episode in the Life of St. Boniface” *Catholic Historical Review* 21, no. 2 (1935): 190–95; Jeffrey B. Russell, “Saint Boniface and the Eccentrics,” *Church History* 33, no. 3 (1964): 235–47; Jeffrey B. Russell, *Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1965), 102–7; Flint, *Rise of Magic*, 168–69; and Faure, “L’ange du haut Moyen Âge occidental,” 37. The main primary sources are available in *Monumenta germaniae historica: Epistolae selectae*, vol. 1, ed. Michael Tangl (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1916) (hereafter Tangl, MGH). An English translation is available in Ephraim Emerton, *The Letters of Saint Boniface* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940).

176. Letter 59, in Tangl, MGH, 111, 114.

177. “Domine Deus omnipotens, Christi filii Dei pater, domini nostri Iesu Christi, et A et ω, qui sedis super septimo throno et super Cherubin et Seraphin. . . . Prēcor vos et coniuro vos, et supplico me ad vos, angelus Uriel, angelus Raguel, angelus Tubuel, angelus Michael, angelus Adinus, angelus Tubuas, angelus Sabaoc, angelus Simiel.” Ibid., 117; translation in Emerton, *Letters of Saint Boniface*, 105.

178. Russell has pointed this out in “Saint Boniface and the Eccentrics,” 237.

179. See Dumville, “Biblical Apocrypha and the Early Irish.”

180. Cf. Lester K. Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 173–85. Little discusses the influx of Irish monastic culture into Francia, particularly in the sixth and seventh centuries. It is possible that the direct or indirect influences on Aldebert entered the region as part of this same movement. Little even mentions Soissons among the sites of Irish influence (175, 183).

181. “Adfirmans se etiam angelorum nomina scire, quorum in tuis sillabis nobis conscripta direxisti; quae nomina nōs non angelorum, sed magis demoniorum adfirmamus.” Letter 57, in Tangl, MGH, 104; translation in Emerton, *Letters of Saint Boniface*, 96.

182. “Quia octo nomina angelorum, quę in sua oratione Aldebertus invocavit, non angelorum praeferquam Michaelis, sed magis demones in sua oratione sibi ad prestandum auxilium invocavit. Nos autem, ut a vestro sancto apostolatu edocemur et divina tradit auctoritas, non plus quam trium angelorum nomina cognoscimus, id est Michael, Gabriel, Raphael. Vel siquidem iste sub obtentu

angelorum, demonum nomina introduxit." Letter 59, in Tangl, *MGH*, 117; translation in Emerton, *Letters of Saint Boniface*, 105.

183. "Qui etiam sub obtentu angelorum in suo auxilio demones invocat." Letter 59, in Tangl, *MGH*, 118; translation in Emerton, *Letters of Saint Boniface*, 106.

184. Letter 77, in Tangl, *MGH*, 160–61; translation in Emerton, *Letters of Saint Boniface*, 135.

185. "Omnibus. 16. Item in eodem concilio, ut ignota angelorum nomina nec fingantur, nec nominentur, nisi illos quos habemus in auctoritate: id sunt Michael, Gabrihel, Raphahel." Pertz, *Monumenta germaniae historica*, 57.

186. "16. De ignotis angelorum nominibus. Item in eodem concilio praecipitur, ut ignota angelorum nomina nec fingantur nec nominentur, nisi illorum quos habemus in auctoritate. Hi sunt Michael, Gabriel, Raphael." Ibid., 276.

187. See esp. Nancy Caciola, *Discerning Spirits: Divine and Demonic Possession in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).

188. See Kieckhefer, "Specific Rationality of Medieval Magic."

189. Dyan Elliott, *Proving Woman: Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 264–84; see also Caciola, *Discerning Spirits*, 291–312.

190. The most likely dating places the composition in the last decades of the twelfth century. Véronèse, "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge," 1:116–58.

191. Jean Dupèbe, "L'Ars notoria et la polémique sur la divination et la magie," in *Divination et controverse religieuse en France au XVIe siècle* (Paris: L'É.N.S. de Jeunes Filles, 1987), 125.

192. Véronèse, "Les anges dans l'Ars notoria," 816–22, 825.

193. Ibid., 814–15, 821–22, 824–25; Jean-Patrice Boudet, "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge: Une résurgence de la théurgie antique?" in *La magie: Actes du colloque international de Montpellier* (25–27 mars 1999), vol. 3, *Du monde latin au monde contemporain*, ed. Alain Moreau and Jean-Claude Turpin (Montpellier: Publications de la Recherche Université Paul-Voléry, 2000), 187.

194. For a partial list of condemnations, see Frank Klaassen, "English Manuscripts of Magic, 1300–1500: A Preliminary Survey," in Fanger, *Conjuring Spirits*, 30n44. For the most thorough treatment, see Véronèse, "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge," 1:637–63.

195. "Ideo videtur esse inordinatum a daemonibus inquirere de futuris quia ea non cognoscunt, sed hoc est proprium Dei, ut dictum est. Sed veritates scientiarum daemones sciunt; quia scientiae sunt de his quae sunt ex necessitate et semper, quae subiacent humanae cognitioni, et multo magis daemonum, qui sunt perspicaciiores, ut Augustinus dicit. Ergo non videtur esse peccatum uti arte notoria, etiam si per daemones sortiatur effectum." Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 2–2, q. 96, art. 1. See also Claire Fanger, "Plundering the Egyptian Treasure: John the Monk's *Book of Visions* and Its Relation to the Ars Notoria of Solomon," in Fanger, *Conjuring Spirits*, 222–24; Véronèse, "Les anges dans l'Ars notoria," 826; Véronèse, "L'Ars notoria au Moyen Âge," 1:644–47.

196. John of Morigny, "Prologue," trans. and ed. Fanger and Watson, 181.

197. See Claire Fanger's chapter in this volume.

198. See, e.g., John's statements in John of Morigny, "Prologue," trans. and ed. Fanger and Watson, 204–5.

199. "And in this same year [1323], there was a monk of Morigny, an abbey near Etampes, who through his curiosity and pride wanted to inspire and renew a condemned heresy and sorcery called in Latin Ars Notoria, although he hoped to give it another name and title. . . . The said book was justly condemned in Paris as false and evil, against the Christian faith, and condemned to be burned and put in the fire." *Grandes chroniques de France*, quoted in Nicholas Watson, "John the Monk's *Book of Visions of the Blessed and Undeified Virgin Mary*," in Fanger, *Conjuring Spirits*, 224.

200. "Ipsi vero Diabolo inspirante moti invidia et cupiditate sub similitudine veritatis falsitatem publicantes, quod falsum est dicere et absurdum, quia virum iniquum [sic] et immundum impossibile est per artem veraciter operari, nec spiritibus aliquibus homo obligatur, set ipsi inviti coguntur mundatis hominibus respondere et sua beneficita penitus adimplere." *Liber iuratus*, §1 (Hedegård, 60).

201. "Paganici sacrificant spiritibus aereis et terreis et eos non constringunt, set fingunt spiritus se constringi per verba legis eorum, ut ydolis fidem adhibeant et ad veram fidem nullatenus convertantur. Et quia fidem malam habent, opera eorum nulla." *Liber iuratus*, §III (Hedegård, 66).

202. Ibid. See Claire Fanger's chapter in this volume.

203. Honorius actually alters the Athanasian Creed to this effect: "Quicumque vult salvus esse et visionem Dei habere, ante omnia opus est, ut teneat catholicam fidem, quam nisi quisque integrum

inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio *visionem divinam non habebit*. . . . Qui vult ergo salvus esse et *visionem divinam habere*, ita de trinitate senciat. . . . Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam eternam et *visionem divinam, quam nunc petimus*, qui vero mala, in ignem eternum, cui nunc abrenunciare postulamus. Hec est fides catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit nec *hanc divinam visionem optimere quibit*." *Liber iuratus*, §XIII (Hedegård, 74–76).

204. "Hic est liber, quem nulla lex habet nisi Christiana, et si habet, nil sibi prodest." *Liber iuratus*, §CXLI (Hedegård, 150).

205. *Liber iuratus*, §LII (Hedegård, 92).

206. Kieckhefer, "Devil's Contemplatives," 255–57.

207. See Veenstra's chapter in this volume.

208. *Liber iuratus*, §III (Hedegård, 65–66).

209. *Liber iuratus*, §III (Hedegård, 44–45). In the fourth section alone they are twice described as "terreis angelis" (§CXXXV [Hedegård, 142, 144]). Demons ("demones") are mentioned, though they are hierarchically subordinate to these angels (§CXXXV [Hedegård, 143]).

210. Klaassen, "English Manuscripts of Magic," 12, 19.

211. "Hostilis demonum potencia per precepta nostra." *Liber iuratus*, §I (Hedegård, 60).

212. "Te suppliciter exoro et invoco, ut ex dono gracie tue et virtute sanctorum tuorum nominum, ut isti prenominati venti hos demones, quos invocavero, congregent, constringant et ligent eos meis petitionibus penitus obedire." *Liber iuratus*, §CXXVIII (Hedegård, 133).

213. "Interrogatus si dictus angelus Acrahel est bonus angelus vel malus, dixit quod bonus, ut sunt alii angeli sperales motores septem orbium planetarum, prout filiosphi refferunt." Falgaïrolle, *Envouement en Gévaudan*, 71. I am grateful to Jan Bulman for pointing out this reference.

214. Boudet, "Magie théurgique," 853–54. The reference in Eymeric's work gives a different title, though the name Honorius is mentioned.

215. Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages*, 170–71; Boudet, "Magie théurgique," 869–70. The Latin critical edition is available in Jean-Patrice Boudet, "Les condamnations de la magie à Paris en 1398," *Revue Mabilon*, new ser., 12 (2001): 121–57. There is a partial English translation in Lynn Thorndike, *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), 264–66, reprinted in Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, *Witchcraft in Europe, 400–1700: A Documentary History*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 131–32. The following quotations are from this source.

216. "Twenty-eighth article, that by certain magic arts we can reach the vision of the divine essence or of the holy spirits. An error."

217. "Twenty-third article, that some demons are good, some benign, some omniscient, some neither saved nor damned. An error."

218. "Twenty-fifth article, that one demon is king of the east and by his especial merit, another of the west, another of the north, another of the south. An error."

219. "Eighth article, that magic arts and like superstitions and their observance are prohibited by the church irrationally. Error."

220. "Twelfth article, that holy words and certain devout prayers and fasts and ablutions and bodily continence in boys and others, and the celebrating mass and other works of a good sort, which are performed in carrying on such arts, excuse these from evil and do not rather accuse them. An error." Boudet's edition continues: "nam per talia sacre res, immo ipse Deus in eucharistia demonibus temptatur immolari; et hoc procurat demon, vel qui vult in hoc honorari similiter Altissimo, vel ad fraudes suas occultandas, vel ut simplices illaque et facilius et damnable perdat."

221. "Twenty-first article, that the blood of a hoopoe or kid or other animal, or virgin parchment or lionskin and the like have efficacy to compel and repel demons by the aid of arts of this sort. An error." Cf. *Liber iuratus*, §IV (Hedegård, 69).

222. "Ninth article, that God is induced by magic arts and sorcery to compel demons to obey invocations. An error."

223. "Seventeenth article, that demons are really forced and coerced by such arts and do not pretend to be compelled in order to seduce men. An error."

224. "Eleventh article, that to use such things in such wise is not to sacrifice or immolate to demons and consequently not damnable idolatry. An error."

225. "Fifth article, that it is licit to use for a good end magic arts or other superstitions forbidden by God and the church. Error." Boudet's edition continues: "quia, secundum Apostolum, non sunt

facienda mala ut bona eveniant." Also: "Sixteenth article, that on this account the said arts are good and from God and that it is licit to observe them, because sometimes or often it happens through them, as those employing them seek or predict, or because good sometimes comes from them. An error."

226. "Fourteenth article, that God himself directly or through good angels revealed such sorceries to holy men. An error and blasphemy."

227. "Nineteenth article, that good angels are shut up in stones, and that they consecrate images or vestments, or do other things which are comprised in those arts. An error and blasphemy."

228. "Third article, that to enter on a pact with demons, tacit or express, is not idolatry or a species of idolatry and apostasy. Error." Boudet's edition continues: "et intendimus esse pactum implicitum in omni observatione superstitiosa cuius effectus non debet a Deo vel natura rationabiliter expectari."

229. Dee owned the copy of the *Sworn Book* that is preserved as London, British Library, Sloane 313. See *John Dee's Library Catalog*, ed. Julian Roberts and Andrew G. Watson (London: Bibliographical Society, 1990), 57, 168. He also possessed a copy of Ganell's text, on which see Veenstra's chapter in this volume.

230. For some new perspectives on an old debate, see Kieckhefer, "Did Magic Have a Renaissance?"

231. In addition to chapter 6 in this volume, see, all by Weill-Parot, "Images astrologiques," 611–22; "Antonio da Montolmo et la magie hermétique," in *Hermetism from Late Antiquity to Humanism*, ed. Paolo Lucentini, Ilaria Parri, and Vittoria Perrone Compagni (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 545–68; "Astral Magic and Intellectual Changes (Twelfth–Fifteenth Centuries): 'Astrological Images' and the Concept of 'Addressative' Magic," in Bremmer and Veenstra, *Metamorphosis of Magic*, 167–87; "Dans le ciel ou sous le ciel? Les anges dans la magie astrale, XIIe–XIVe siècle," in Boudet, Bresc, and Grévin, "Les anges et la magie au Moyen Âge," 761–71.

232. Note especially *De occultis et manifestis*, 5.2–3.

233. See Weill-Parot, "Images astrologiques," 605, 621–38, and "Astral Magic," 178–84.

234. BnF, lat. 7273, fols. 137va–140ra.

235. Fanger and Klaassen, "Magic III: Middle Ages," 724–28.

236. See Michael D. Bailey, *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), esp. 130–38; see also Michael D. Bailey, "From Sorcery to Witchcraft: Clerical Conceptions of Magic in the Later Middle Ages," *Speculum* 76, no. 4 (2001): 960–90. Also of particular relevance to this change is Weill-Parot's chapter "Les signes d'un nouveau climat intellectuel: Polémiques, procès et émergence des nouveaux magiciens (fin du XIVe siècle–première moitié du XVe siècle)," in "Images astrologiques," 591–638.

# 4

## HONORIUS AND THE SIGIL OF GOD:

### THE *Liber iuratus* IN BERENGARIO GANELL'S *Summa sacre magice*

Jan R. Veenstra

The origins of the *Sworn Book of Honorius*, until now known only through a small group of British Library manuscripts, are hidden behind the veils of history. The material evidence hitherto available seems to limit its medieval reception to the London area; internal evidence might suggest that part of the material contained in the book originated in southern France. Its unbalanced composition has led scholars to believe that it is a compilation of two texts, the one a thirteenth-century manual of demonic magic, the other a fourteenth-century theurgical treatise inspired by Jewish mysticism. Reliable references to the work date from the mid-fourteenth century and later, with the exception of William of Auvergne's reference to a *Liber sacratus* from around 1240, which is currently generally believed to apply to a "consecrated" text other than the one by Honorius.<sup>1</sup>

A mystifying text of uncertain pedigree is a strong incentive for scholarly speculation (and given the secondary literature so far, well-founded speculation), but to put the existing hypotheses to the test, further source evidence is required. In the case of Honorius, Carlos Gilly's discovery of the *Summa sacre magice*, a colossal fourteenth-century compendium of magic written by the Catalan or Valencian scholar Berengario Ganell, brings to light hitherto unnoticed materials that shed new light on (and further complicate) the tradition of the Honorius ritual.<sup>2</sup> In his *Summa*, Ganell incorporated substantial parts of the *Liber iuratus* as it is known from the London manuscripts. The references to his source, however, are not always explicit, and even when Ganell literally copies several pages, the origin of the material can only be gleaned through a simple

This essay was researched and written during my stay as a fellow at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. I wish to thank Katelyn Mesler and Claire Fanger for reading and commenting on the text, and Claire for her valuable suggestions in structuring the argument and for adding explanatory translations for some of the Latin lines.